

FILE NO: 180632

Petitions and Communications received from May 25, 2018, through June 4, 2018, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 12, 2018.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information will not be redacted.

From the Department of Public Health and San Francisco Public Library, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), submitting notice of a State grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval. 2 reports. Copy: Each Supervisor (1)

From Public Works, submitting the results of the investigation to rename Phelan Avenue to Frida Kahlo Way. File No. 180371. (2)

From Assembly Member Phil Ting, regarding the proposed legislation to rename Julius Kahn Playground. File No. 180394. (3)

From the Capital Planning Committee, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.21, regarding approval of the recommendation on the FY2018-2019 and FY2019-2020 General Fund Department Capital Budget totaling \$533 million. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Harlan L. Kelly, Jr., General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Charter, Section 8B.125, submitting notice of a Correction of an Error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for FY2018-2019 through FY2021-2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Department of Human Resources, submitting an Administrative Code, Chapter 12B, Waiver Request. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of the City Administrator, pursuant to Ordinance No. 189-16, placing Oklahoma, effective November 1, 2018, on the Covered State List, which places a ban on City contracts and travel to states with anti-LGBT laws. File No. 160425. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Jordan Park Improvement Association, regarding the SFMTA amending the Transportation Code, Division II, Article 900. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Family Council at St. Luke's Hospital, regarding patient transfer concerns. File No. 170773. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Office of the Controller City Performance Unit's Lean Team, submitting a report summarizing the improvement work resulting from a project with the Recreation and Park Department's Structural Maintenance Yard. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Don and Karen Grey, regarding the need for renovation at the Children's Library at the Mission Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the California Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee, regarding proposition E. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Daniel, regarding motorized scooters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Tami Bryan, regarding the Police Commission appointments. File no. 180408 and 180409. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Marie Ma, regarding the nomination of John Hamasaki to the Police Commission. File No. 180538. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Dorsey Nunn, Executive Director, Legal Services for Prisoners with Children, regarding the nomination of Anne Irwin to the Police Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Bonnie and Robert White, regarding proposed legislation renaming Phelan Way to Frida Kahlo Way. File No. 180371. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Tyler Shanahan, General Manager, Travelodge at the Presidio, regarding an issue with the Fire Department. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From concerned citizens, regarding the homeless in the City. Copy: Each Supervisor. 2 letters. (19)

From the Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee (LBEAC), regarding proposed legislation requiring a Citywide Project Labor Agreement for Public Works or Improvements Projects. File No. 170205. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Martin T. Lyon, regarding Tasers. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Marvis J. Phillips, regarding the proposed legislation to make 234-246 1st Street (a.k.a. Phillips Building) a landmark. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigration Affairs, regarding the Immigrant Rights Commission's policy of separating children from their parents at the border. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From the Sheriff's Department, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 96A, submitting a 2018 First Quarter report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From The Planning Department, submitting Addendum #3 to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)



City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
POPULATION HEALTH AND PREVENTION

1380 Howard Street, Rm. 448
San Francisco, CA 94103-2614
415.255.3450 FAX 415.255.3675

May 31, 2018

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Victoria Vasilevitsky
(415) 255-3462
victoria.vasilevitsky@sfdph.org

Cc: Controller's Office AOSD

Subject: Grant Budget Revision Tuberculosis ELG GC Rapid Detention & Response Grant

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a Federal pass thru PHFE grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

A signed copy of budget revision is attached for your review.

Please feel free to contact me @ (415) 255-3462 or victoria.vasilevitsky@sfdph.org if you have any questions.

Thank you.

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

SALARIES AND FRINGES

\$424,177

Principal Investigator - S. Philip

Annual Salary: \$277,275 x .03 effort = No Salary Requested

This position serves as the Principal Investigator for the designated local jurisdiction for this project and will collaborate with the California Department of Public Health and other project PI's to ensure that the Project meets all the funding requirements. Dr. Philip is the San Francisco Department of Public Health Population Health Division Disease Prevention and Control Branch Director. She has over 8 years of experience in STD and HIV clinical care, epidemiology, and evaluation. She served previously as the Director for the SFDPH STD Prevention and Control Services Section and continues in her role as the City STD Controller. Key units/staff in DPC include San Francisco City Clinic, the Public Health Laboratory, and all SFDPH DIS staff. In both the STD Section and DPC Branch, quantitative and qualitative data are extensively used for evaluation and quality assurance of programs and activities, and shared with organizational and community partners.

Co-Principal Investigator - T. Aragon

Annual Salary: \$287,370 x .01 effort = No Salary Request

This position is the Co-PI for this project and will work with the other PI's to ensure that the Project meets all funding requirements, follows the standardized protocols and procedures and adheres to CDC's Data Security and Confidentiality Guidelines. They may participate in conference calls and/or attend mandatory project meetings. As the Director of the Population Health Division, this position has overall oversight and responsibility for all grants awarded to the Division and for the Program's compliance with funding requirements.

San Francisco Public Health Laboratory Director - G. Masinde

Annual Salary: \$160,850 x .01 effort = No Salary Request

This position provides Public Health Laboratory oversight and supervision as well as ensures compliance for this project. This position will work with the PI's and coordinator to ensure that all related laboratory testing follows the standardized protocols and procedures. He may participate in conference calls and/or attend mandatory project meetings.

ÉLC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

0.50 FTE - Epi II - T. Nguyen

Annual Salary: \$112,398 x 0.50 FTE, plus 45% fringe Requested @ 8 months

\$54,326

This position will oversee all project activities to ensure compliance as well as performing QA of data reported through the various data collection streams and implement and adhere to protocol agreement for project activities.

This position will provide epidemiological support for data collection and data management, including verifying, analyzing, interpreting, and summarizing data reports for this project. This position will also provide technical assistance to participating health providers; providing training and epidemiological support for the staff performing interviews, partner services, and quality assurance of these data; and for dissemination of findings to appropriate stakeholders. They will also be responsible for responding to requests from the funder for data as well as participate on project conference calls and attend required project meetings as needed.

Her time on this grant will be in kind from July 2017-November 2017; Salary is requested at .50 FTE from December 2017 - July 2018; Once the EPI II is hired .05 FTE of the .50 FTE will be for the differential pay for supervisory support of the grant's Epidemiologist II position

0.27 FTE - Epi II - R. Kohn

Annual Salary: \$112,389 x 0.27 FTE, plus 45% fringe Requested @ 8 months

\$29,336

This position will ensure implementation and quality assurance of data entry, data collection and data cleaning as well as oversee and maintain the electronic database and data system for this project.

This position will provide epidemiological support for data collection and data management, including verifying, analyzing, interpreting, and summarizing data reports for this project. This position will be responsible for data management, analysis and dissemination; cleaning, formatting, and transmitting data to CDPH and CDC within agreed upon timelines. They will also participate on project conference calls and attend required project meetings as needed.

His time on this grant will be in kind from July 2017-November 2017; Salary is requested at .30 FTE from December 2017 - July 2018.

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Sr. Physician Specialist- S. Cohen

Annual Salary: \$234,676 x .05 effort = No Salary Requested)

This position is the STD Clinic Medical Director and is responsible for supervising, training and evaluating clinical staff; performing quality assurance of medical records; providing medical care to STD Clinic and HIV patients; overseeing research projects occurring at the Clinic; supervising the STD HIV Care Program and the HIV PEP and PrEP Programs; providing technical assistance to private providers regarding management of patients, including gonorrhea patients or partners with reduced susceptibility to antibiotics; performing medical updates regarding STDs for health care providers and acting as the liaison with the medical community for the purpose of increasing awareness of STD symptoms, screening recommendations, treatment guidelines, and the emergence of antibiotic resistant gonorrhea. This position also directly supervises the health worker who oversees the DIS who will be conducting SURRG partner services and is the clinical lead for all follow-up testing and treatment of SURRG patients and partners.

HW IV - M. Lee

Annual Salary: \$85,883 x .10 effort = No Salary Requested

This position is responsible for training and supervising the field staff who will conduct the case investigations for this project, including case reviews. This person is responsible for coordinating the STD Screening Program, which includes oversight of GC screening and treatment needs at San Francisco City Clinic, private providers, and community-based health providers. The STD Screening Program has established relationships with community based health providers (e.g., 3rd Street Youth Center and Clinic) to facilitate the integration and expansion of STD screening into their practices; provides STD training and technical assistance to private providers and health clinics in the City; and performs facility visitations to screening sites as needed.

1.0 FTE - 2802 EPII - TBD

Annual Salary: \$107,066 x 1.00 FTE, plus 45% fringe @ 3 months

\$38,811

This position will provide epidemiological support for data collection and data management, including verifying, analyzing, interpreting, and summarizing data reports for this project. This position has a Masters Degree in Public Health and 4+ years experience in epidemiology and surveillance activities. They will be responsible for data management, analysis and dissemination, generation of program reports; providing technical assistance to participating health providers; providing epidemiological support for the staff performing interviews, partner services, and quality assurance of these data; cleaning, formatting, and transmitting data to CDPH and CDC within agreed upon timelines; and for dissemination of findings to appropriate stakeholders. They will also be responsible for responding to requests from the funder for data as well as participate on project conference calls and attend required project meetings as needed.

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

0.40 FTE - 2802 Epi I - H. Brosnan

Annual Salary: \$88,300 x 0.40 FTE, plus 45% fringe-- NO SALARY REQUESTED

\$0

This position will be responsible for data management, analysis and dissemination, generation of program reports; providing technical assistance to participating health providers; providing epidemiological support for the staff performing interviews, partner services, and qualitative data collection, including quality assurance of these data; cleaning, formatting, and transmitting data to CDPH and CDC within agreed upon timelines; and for dissemination of findings to appropriate stakeholders. They will also be responsible for responding to requests from the funder for data as well as participate on project conference calls and attend required project meetings.

HW IV - R. Shaw

Annual Salary: \$83,494 x .10 effort = No Salary Requested

This position is responsible for training and supporting supervision of the field staff which will conduct the case investigations, including case reviews.

Sr. Microbiologist - J. Carlson

Annual Salary: \$102,726 x .10 effort = No Salary Requested

This position provides supervision for the project microbiologist and ensures compliance for this project. This position is responsible for oversight of receiving and processing the project lab specimens, assisting lab staff with specimens, performing quality control testing of these tests and data-entry of results.

1.0 FTE - 2462/2463 Microbiologist - TBD

Microbiologist - Annual Salary: \$102,726 x 1.00 FTE, plus 45% fringe @ 10 months

\$124,127

Under general supervision, conducts bacteriologic, parasitologic, serologic and related laboratory tests and examinations; and performs related duties as required. Requires responsibility for: performing scientific tests and investigations according to instructions and established methods and procedures; keeping complete and accurate records and submitting accurate reports on the results of investigations.

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

2.0 FTE - 2587 Health Worker III - TBD

Annual Salary: \$73,480 x 2.00 FTE, plus 45% fringe @ 10 months

\$177,577

These positions will provide case investigation, including provider-reported case and treatment information and partner follow-up for this project. One position will be located at SFCC as part of the STD Clinic Partner Services Team and provides case management and partner services (PS) for newly diagnosed gonorrhea cases with reduced susceptibility; conducts case investigations of sexual and social contacts of gonorrhea cases with reduced susceptibility; performs phlebotomy for syphilis and/or HIV partners and sexual network contacts; makes and verifies completion of referrals; performs follow up for patients who do not return for their test results or who are infected with gonorrhea and need treatment; and performs data entry in the STD database. One position will be initially trained at SFCC with the Partner Services Team, but will eventually be embedded at the 3rd Street Youth Center and Clinic in order to develop and implement PS protocols and best practices for youth. This embedded DIS will interview patients diagnosed with gonorrhea per established protocols; counsel and motivate patients to seek and notify partners, either directly or with Health Department assistance; perform on-site and field follow up of gonorrhea cases, contacts for referral to prevention, mental health and social services, as needed; document activities and entering data into the ISCHTR database as appropriate in a timely, accurate and comprehensive fashion per established protocols; and perform HIV and STD screening that may include collecting urine, rectal and pharyngeal specimens and drawing blood. These activities may be performed in the field, at health fairs and in other settings and may be held in the evening, nights or on weekends.

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

TRAVEL	\$13,933
Local Mileage - 2 HWIII, monthly & 4 ELC SF Staff to Richmond x 4 times	\$1,500
Per ELC J1 FOA Strategy 1, Activity 4, funds are requested for 2 staff to attend the National Coalition of STD Directors Meeting, the only meeting in the US that is held for STD prevention and sexual health professionals with strong training, education, and policy components. Meeting location is Alexandria, Virginia in November 2017	
2 staff x \$1,076 out-of-state airfare = \$2152	
2 staff x \$150 lodging x 4 nights = \$1200	
2 staff x \$100 transportation cost = \$200	\$3,552
Per ELC J1 FOA Strategy 1, Activity 4, funds are requested for 1 SFDPH microbiologist to attend the American Society for Microbiology (ASM) Microbe Meeting, a national microbiology meeting, for workforce development and training related to rapid response for resistant gonorrhea. Meeting location is TBD in June 2018.	
1 staff from SFDPH	
1 staff x \$1,076.40 out-of-state airfare = \$1,076	
1 staff x \$150 lodging x 3 nights = \$450	
1 staff x 100 transportation costs = \$100	\$1,626
Per the J1 FOA, section v. Funding Strategy, funds are requested for 3 SFDPH staff to attend the required annual ELC J1: Threat of Antibiotic-Resistant gonorrhea: Rapid Detection & Response Capacity grantee meeting. Location TBD, but likely at CDC in Atlanta, GA.	
For 3 SFDPH staff:	
3 staff x \$1,076.40 out-of-state airfare = \$3,229	
3 staff x \$150 lodging x 4 nights = \$1,800	
3 staff x \$100 transportation cost = \$300	\$5,329
Funds will be used to support 3 SFDPH staff to attend relevant trainings, such as Passport to Partner Services	
1 staff from SFDPH	
1 staff x \$1,076.40 out-of-state airfare = \$1076	
1 staff x \$150 lodging x 5 nights = \$750	
1 staff x \$100 transportation cost = \$100	\$1,926
OTHER COSTS	\$12,941

**ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018**

Funds are being requested to purchase general office supplies on behalf of the SFDPH contractor for staff to carry out daily activities of the program. Office supplies include pens, copy papers, toners, binders, folders, stapler etc. \$1,000

Funds are being requested to purchase office furniture \$971

Funds are being requested by SFDPH for packaging and shipping of specimens per protocol from participating clinics to SF PHL for testing as well as for shipping supplies from PHL to ARLN and CDC labs. These are to include courier service from the clinic to PHL as well as dry ice for isolate shipment from PHL to ARLN and CDC.

Courier service: \$100/week x 52 weeks = \$5200

Dry Ice (Alert shipments) \$100 dry ice/shipment x (500 total samples tested x 3% resistant) = \$1500

Grand Total = \$6700

\$6,700

Funds are being requested for registration fees

\$1,650

Funds are being requested for staff development

\$1,000

Funds requested for communication costs utilizing cell phones and service for the project. Budget is estimated at one time cost of \$90 per phone + \$120 per month for 2 phones for 6 months

\$1,620

INDIRECT COSTS

Indirect Costs = 25% of total salaries and fringes

\$106,044

TOTAL BUDGET

\$557,095

Acct 540000
Acct 581360
\$99 phones
\$1,620 w/o

ELC GC RAPID DETECTION AND RESPONSE
AUGUST 1, 2017 TO JULY 31, 2018

BUDGET SUMMARY

SALARIES AND FRINGES	\$424,177
TRAVEL	\$13,933
OTHER COSTS	\$12,941
INDIRECT COSTS	\$106,044
TOTAL BUDGET	\$557,095.29

Lege/Gen	Account	Fund	Code	Authority	FC	Est. Unit	Project	Priority	Fiscal Year	Period	Budget	Expenses	Encumbrances	Pre-Encumbrances	Available Budget
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029181	2	2018	6	27,244.81	0	0	0	-7,542.91	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029182	2	2018	6	0	2,222.40	0	0	-2,222.40	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029183	2	2018	7	0	10,467.84	0	0	-10,467.84	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029184	2	2018	8	0	13,814.61	0	0	-13,814.61	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029185	2	2018	9	0	13,633.37	0	0	-13,633.37	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029186	2	2018	10	0	13,181.16	0	0	-13,181.16	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029187	2	2018	11	0	14,855.64	0	0	-14,855.64	
CC DETAIL	510010	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029188	2	2018	12	0	17,143.02	0	0	-17,143.02	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029189	2	2018	1	0	231	0	0	-231	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029190	2	2018	2	0	82.00	0	0	-82.00	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029191	2	2018	3	0	218.14	0	0	-218.14	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029192	2	2018	4	0	540.4	0	0	-540.4	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029193	2	2018	5	0	774.51	0	0	-774.51	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029194	2	2018	6	0	631.13	0	0	-631.13	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029195	2	2018	7	0	661	0	0	-661	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029196	2	2018	8	0	38.54	0	0	-38.54	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029197	2	2018	9	0	283.4	0	0	-283.4	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029198	2	2018	10	0	614.04	0	0	-614.04	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029199	2	2018	11	0	122.31	0	0	-122.31	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029200	2	2018	12	0	2,051.86	0	0	-2,051.86	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029201	2	2018	1	0	524.4	0	0	-524.4	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029202	2	2018	2	0	1,087.49	0	0	-1,087.49	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029203	2	2018	3	0	796.6	0	0	-796.6	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029204	2	2018	4	0	352.26	0	0	-352.26	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029205	2	2018	5	0	73.15	0	0	-73.15	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029206	2	2018	6	0	490.61	0	0	-490.61	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029207	2	2018	7	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029208	2	2018	8	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029209	2	2018	9	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029210	2	2018	10	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029211	2	2018	11	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029212	2	2018	12	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029213	2	2018	1	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029214	2	2018	2	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029215	2	2018	3	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029216	2	2018	4	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029217	2	2018	5	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029218	2	2018	6	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029219	2	2018	7	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029220	2	2018	8	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029221	2	2018	9	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029222	2	2018	10	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029223	2	2018	11	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029224	2	2018	12	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029225	2	2018	1	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029226	2	2018	2	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029227	2	2018	3	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029228	2	2018	4	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029229	2	2018	5	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029230	2	2018	6	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029231	2	2018	7	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029232	2	2018	8	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029233	2	2018	9	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029234	2	2018	10	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029235	2	2018	11	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029236	2	2018	12	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029237	2	2018	1	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029238	2	2018	2	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029239	2	2018	3	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029240	2	2018	4	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029241	2	2018	5	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029242	2	2018	6	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029243	2	2018	7	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029244	2	2018	8	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029245	2	2018	9	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029246	2	2018	10	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029247	2	2018	11	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029248	2	2018	12	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029249	2	2018	1	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029250	2	2018	2	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029251	2	2018	3	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029252	2	2018	4	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029253	2	2018	5	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029254	2	2018	6	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029255	2	2018	7	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029256	2	2018	8	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029257	2	2018	9	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029258	2	2018	10	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029259	2	2018	11	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029260	2	2018	12	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029261	2	2018	1	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029262	2	2018	2	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020	11340	11374	10001	FFGOV	10029263	2	2018	3	0	0	0	0	0	
CC DETAIL	510020														

Vasilevitsky, Victoria (DPH)

From: Nguyen, Trang (DPH)
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 1:18 PM
To: Vasilevitsky, Victoria (DPH)
Cc: Kwan, Amy (DPH); Kwong, Amanda (DPH); Brown, Marisel (DPH)
Subject: FW: ELC/SURRG: Requested Revision to SFDPH Year 2 Budget
Attachments: SF ELC Budget Justification_YR02_Revision_18_02_08_v2.xlsx

Hi, Victoria.

Amy Kwan notified me of the problem in the certification of the cell phones we want to purchase from the ELC/SURRG grant.

We had in March modified the budget (to include a Communications line and alter FTE charges) and received verbal approval from the funder but now also have documented approval (see email below).

Amanda Kwong and Marisel Brown will be working with you regarding the changes in FTE charges.

But if the attached revised budget is sufficient to move forward with purchasing the cell phones, that would be great.

Please let us know.

Thank you,
Trang

Trang Nguyen, PhD, MPH
Epidemiologist
Applied Research, Community Health Epidemiology, and Surveillance Branch
Population Health Division
San Francisco Department of Public Health
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415.437.6256

From: Rochelle McLaurin [mailto:RMcLaurin@HelunaHealth.org]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 1:03 PM
To: Nguyen, Trang (DPH) <trang.nguyen@sfdph.org>; Starling, Cheryl (CDPH-CID-DCDC) <Cheryl.Starling@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Hogue, Cheryl (CDPH-CID-DCDC-STD) (Cheryl.Hogue@cdph.ca.gov) <Cheryl.Hogue@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: ELC/SURRG: Requested Revision to SFDPH Year 2 Budget

Greetings Trang,

Thank you for the information for the request. Based on my review, I approve this request and will update our records. In this particular case, an amendment is not required.

Thank you, Rochelle



Rochelle McLaurin, MBA
Assistant Director, Contract and Grant Management
Heluna Health
Phone: 562.222.7883
Mobile: 562.480.2736
Email: rmclaurin@helunahealth.org
Website: www.helunahealth.org



From: Nguyen, Trang (DPH) [<mailto:trang.nguyen@sfdph.org>]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Rochelle McLaurin; Starling, Cheryl (CDPH-CID-DCDC)
Cc: Hogue, Cheryl (CDPH-CID-DCDC-STD) (Cheryl.Hogue@cdph.ca.gov)
Subject: ELC/SURRG: Requested Revision to SFDPH Year 2 Budget

Hi, Rochelle and Cheryl S.

I have been asked to provide confirmation from the ELC/SURRG funder (CDPH/Heluna Health) of the revised Year 2 ELC/SURRG budget for SFDPH (attached), which you approved verbally during our 3/22/18 phone call.

- As a reminder, the revision includes adjustments to (1) staff FTEs to account for the work being done while we continue to search for a permanent Epi Coordinator and (2) "Other Costs" in order to add a Communications Line, to cover the cost of cell phone purchases and plans that were originally included in the CDPH budget.

Could you please respond to this email to provide documented approval of this budget revision?

Thank you very much!
Trang

Trang Nguyen, PhD, MPH
Epidemiologist
Applied Research, Community Health Epidemiology, and Surveillance Branch
Population Health Division
San Francisco Department of Public Health
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415.437.6256



San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street (Civic Center)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Date: May 24, 2018
To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
CC: Controller's Office Grants Unit
From: San Francisco Public Library
Subject: Grant Budget Revision
Grant Name: LB-FY18 PROJECT READCLLS

In accordance with the Administrative Code Section 10.170-1^H, this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a State grant line item budget revision in excess of the 15% as originally reflected in FAMIS.

Please note that the State agency does not require prior written authorization as this change is still part of the original operation expenditures budget submitted to the grantor.

Attachment: Grant Letter, Budget Expenditure Detail, FSP Screen Shots/Reports, E-mail

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 MAY 29 PM 3:09
BY [Signature]

Lindsley, Lovely (LIB)

From: Weaver, Randy (LIB)
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 3:35 PM
To: Lindsley, Lovely (LIB)
Cc: Eppler, Katherine (LIB)
Subject: CLLS Mid-year/budget revision

Hi Lovely,

The State Library finally got the CLLS reporting database functioning, so I'm now able to get the mid-year budget revision done. This shows our total grant amount received for the year (\$61,711) and the current PO's, paid and outstanding, which we propose to charge to the grant. The last PO (158633) submitted for Baker & Taylor should be our last for the year. As we discussed, the remaining funds (\$45,082) can be used to offset personnel costs.

The final report will be due on or around August 15. It will show final amounts paid from the 158633 PO. Does this make sense?

Section 5: Proposed Expenditures

	Adult & Family Literacy CLLS \$ Portion
Salaries & Benefits	\$45,082
Contract Staff	\$0
Operations	\$2,100
Literacy Materials	\$14,068
Small Equipment	\$0
Equipment	\$0
Indirect Costs	\$461
Total	\$61,711

45,074


465

Randall Weaver



Bridge at Main
San Francisco Public Library
415-557-4390

<http://www.projectreads.org>



California
STATE LIBRARY
FOUNDED 1849
PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE, SHAPING OUR FUTURE

January 3, 2018

Luis Herrera, City Librarian
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin St.
San Francisco, CA 94102-4733

Dear Mr. Herrera: *Luis*

I'm pleased to enclose a claim form for the remainder of your California Library Literacy Services funding for the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

This **final, second payment** of your total allocation for the fiscal year that began July, 2017 is based on:

- A *per capita* amount per adult learner served at your library during the previous fiscal year.
- A *match* on local funds raised and expended for adult literacy services at your library during the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2016.

Earlier this year you received a baseline for your literacy program. The baseline reflects the importance of each library having enough funds to provide local literacy staffing and service.

Below is a re-cap of your total California Library Literacy Services funding for the current program year:

Baseline Adult Literacy Services:	\$18,000 (amount previously claimed)
Final Payment (Per Capita & Match):	\$43,711 (amount to be claimed now)
GRAND TOTAL FOR 2017/18:	\$61,711

Changes in your funding from last year are based on an increase or decrease in the number of adult learners you served, and/or an increase or decrease in the amount of local funds expended on adult literacy last year.

We'll initiate the payment process upon receipt of your signed claim form, which is attached. This final payment will be processed after all reporting requirements from the prior fiscal year have been received, all adjustments made and unexpended monies returned.

The following specific issues or observations are being made about your final report:

None

Please mail the signed claim form to: **California State Library
Fiscal/Local Assistance
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001**

The attached forms require your signature and serve two purposes:

1. Requests to claim the funds and have a check sent to you
2. Certifies that your library will use the funds for the purpose intended; and

In February, you'll be asked to revise your literacy budget for the 2017-2018 fiscal year utilizing the actual total allotment from the State Library shown in this award letter. The budget that you submitted with your application earlier this year was based on projections. Your revised budget should reflect updated information and more accurate figures than you had at the time of application.

You'll be asked to report electronically after the close of the fiscal year. Library literacy services staff will provide more details on this process. If you need a copy of your most recent final report and/or application, please contact Andrea Freeland at andrea.freeland@library.ca.gov.

PLEASE REMEMBER THAT ALL STATE FUNDS MUST BE EXPENDED OR ENCUMBERED BY JUNE 30, 2018 OR RETURNED TO THE STATE.

Should you have additional questions regarding the new funding and/or reporting process, please contact:

Natalie Cole (916) 651-6980 ext. 45 or natalie.cole@library.ca.gov
Andrea Freeland (916) 651-3191 or andrea.freeland@library.ca.gov

Thanks again for your commitment to literacy. It's one of the most transformative and successful things libraries do.

Respectfully yours,


Greg Lucas
California State Librarian

cc: Randy Weaver, Literacy Coordinator (via email: randy.weaver@sfpl.org)
Luis Herrera, City Librarian (via email: lherrera@sfpl.org)

Enc.: Claim Form
Certification Form

**State of California
California Library Literacy and English Acquisition Services (CLLS)**

California Education Code; Section 18880-18883
Budget Citation Chapter 14 - Budget Item 6120-213-0001

Fiscal Year: 2017-2018		
Reporting Structure: 61202000	COA: 5432000;	Approp. Ref: 213;
Purchasing Authority Number: CSL-6120	Category: 84121600	Program #: 5312

FOR PAYMENT OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY LITERACY SERVICES GRANT

Amount Claimed – Second & Final Installment - **\$ 43,711**

claims the indicated allowance for the purposes of carrying out the functions stated in its CLLS application and in Sections 18880-18883 of the California Education Code.

Warrant to be issued for payment to the library to be addressed to:

*

(Authorized agency to receive, disburse and account for CLLS funds)

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury: that the library named above shall use their allowance solely for the purposes indicated in their CLLS application and in Sections 18880-18883 of the California Education Code.

Official Representative or Fiscal Agent (Signature Required)

Title

<p>MAIL ONE ORIGINAL SIGNATURE TO:</p> <p>California State Library Fiscal Office – CLLS P. O. Box 942837 Sacramento, CA 94237-0001</p>

State Library Local Assistance Office Use Only

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, State Library Fiscal Office

By _____
State Library Representative

<p><i>Approval by State:</i></p> <p>CLLS \$ _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p>
--

* The warrant address must match that on file. If you need to change the warrant authorized library name and/or address, please contact Colette Moody, CSL Fiscal Office.

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THIS PAGE

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury: that I am the duly authorized representative of the claimant herein; that the claim is in all respects true, correct and in accordance with law and the terms of the agreement; and that payment has not previously been received for the amount claimed herein.

The claims the indicated allowance for the purposes of carrying out the functions stated in its CLLS application and in Sections 18880-18883 of the California Education Code.

SIGNED

DATE

Signature - Authorized representative

Typed/Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative

Email address of authorized representative



MAIL ONE ORIGINAL SIGNATURE TO:
**California State Library
Fiscal Office – CLLS
P. O. Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001**

Before Adj.

Ledger Group	Account	Fund	Dept	Authority	PC Bus Unit	Project	Activity	Budget Ref	Budget Period	Revenue Estimate	Recognized Revenue	Collected Revenue	Available Budget*	Uncollected Revenue (Rec-Coll)*
CC_REVENUE	444999	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	0	6,202.10	0	-6,202.10	6,202.10
CC_REVENUE	448999	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1	1	2018	50,000.00	0	0	50,000.00	0
										50,000.00	6,202.10	-	43,797.90	6,202.10

Ledger Group	Account	Fund	Dept	Authority	Project	Activity	TRIO	Budget Period	Budget	Expense	Encumbrance	Pre-Encumbrance	Available Budget*
CC_DETAIL	519010	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	-4	0	0	0	-4
CC_DETAIL	520010	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	465	0	0	-465
CC_DETAIL	520010	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	465	0	0	0	465
CC_DETAIL	535990	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	1,935.20	0	0	-1,935.20
CC_DETAIL	535990	13140	232048	10000	10029615	1		2018	0	0	0	0	0
CC_DETAIL	540000	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	49,539.00	0	0	0	49,539.00
CC_DETAIL	549710	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	5,287.64	1,027.08	0	-6,314.72
CC_DETAIL	549710	13140	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	6,650.92	210.37	0	-6,861.29
CC_DETAIL	552115	13120	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	613.95	87.31	0	-701.26
CC_DETAIL	552115	13140	232048	10000	10029615	1		2018	0	0	0	0	0
CC_DETAIL	552115	13140	232048	10001	10029615	1		2018	0	565.35	17.89	0	-583.24
									50,000.00	15,518.06	1,342.65	-	33,139.29

After Adj.

Ledger Group	Account	Fund	Dept	Authority	PC Bus Unit	Project	Activity	Budget Ref	Budget Period	Revenue Estimate	Recognized Revenue	Collected Revenue	Available Budget*	Uncollected Revenue (Rec-Coll)*	Percent Available
CC_REVENUE	444999	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC_REVENUE	448999	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	11,711.00	60,596.06	-	(48,885.06)	60,596.06	-417.43
CC_REVENUE	448999	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1	1	2018	50,000.00	-	-	50,000.00	-	100
										61,711.00	60,596.06	-	1,114.94	60,596.06	

Ledger Group	Account	Fund	Dept	Authority	PC Bus Unit	Project	Activity	Budget Ref	Budget Period	Budget	Expense	Encumbrance	Pre-Encumbrance	Available Budget*	Percent Available
CC_DETAIL	501010	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	30,567.78	-	-	-	30,567.78	100
CC_DETAIL	513010	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	14,514.22	-	-	-	14,514.22	100
CC_DETAIL	519010	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1	1	2018	(4.00)	-	-	-	(4.00)	100
CC_DETAIL	520010	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	465.00	-	-	(465.00)	0
CC_DETAIL	520010	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1	1	2018	465.00	-	-	-	465.00	100
CC_DETAIL	535990	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	2,100.00	1,935.20	-	-	164.80	7.85
CC_DETAIL	535990	13140	232048	10000	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	-	-	-	-	0
CC_DETAIL	540000	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	(35,471.00)	-	-	-	(35,471.00)	100
CC_DETAIL	540000	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1	1	2018	49,539.00	-	-	-	49,539.00	100
CC_DETAIL	549710	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	12,309.28	-	-	(12,309.28)	0
CC_DETAIL	549710	13140	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	-	565.32	-	(565.32)	0
CC_DETAIL	552115	13120	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	1,210.81	-	-	(1,210.81)	0
CC_DETAIL	552115	13140	232048	10000	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	-	-	-	-	0
CC_DETAIL	552115	13140	232048	10001	SFGOV	10029615	1		2018	-	-	(565.32)	-	565.32	0
										61,711.00	15,920.29	-	-	45,790.71	

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:45 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Phelan Avenue Street Name Change
Attachments: Phelan Ave..pdf

Good Morning,

Please see the attached communication from the Department of Public Works regarding its investigation to rename Phelan Avenue.

Thank you,

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
(415) 554-5163 fax
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form by clicking
<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104>

BOS-11

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 MAY 22 AM 9:21
BY AK



May 21, 2018
Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlet Place
City Hall – Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mark Farrell
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

Jerry Sanguinetti
Bureau of Street Use & Mapping
Manager

RE: Official street name change of Phelan Ave. to Frida Kahlo Way.

Bruce R. Storrs P.L.S.
City and County Surveyor

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Bureau of Street Use & Mapping
1155 Market St., 3rd floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
tel (415) 554-5827

Public Works has completed its investigation to rename Phelan Avenue between Ocean Avenue and Flood Avenue to Frida Kahlo Way.

sfpublicworks.org
facebook.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/sfpublicworks

There were no objections from City Agencies. We have also verified that the proposed name does not exist in our currently list of official street names.

The fronting property owners along Phelan Ave were contacted and given the opportunity to comment on the proposed name change. Out of the 23 fronting property owners 7 responded to our inquiry. All 7 responses were against the street name change. The objections to the name change were less than 50% of the fronting property owners, which allows Public Works to recommend moving forward with the proposed name change.

Sincerely,

Bruce R. Storrs, P.L.S.
City & County Surveyor

STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0019
(916) 319-2019
FAX (916) 319-2119

DISTRICT OFFICE
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SUITE 14600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(415) 557-2312
FAX (415) 557-1178

Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov
www.assembly.ca.gov/ting

Assembly California Legislature

PHILIP Y. TING
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, NINETEENTH DISTRICT

丁右立
州眾議員

COMMITTEES
CHAIR: BUDGET
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS
PRIVACY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
UTILITIES AND ENERGY

SELECT COMMITTEES
CHAIR: ASIA/CALIFORNIA TRADE AND
INVESTMENT PROMOTION

May 24, 2018

Mr. Mark Buell
President
San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear President Buell,

I fully support renaming Julius Kahn Playground, which is located in my Assembly district. San Francisco public parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities must reflect all communities and acknowledge the shared values and contributions of all San Franciscans. We should not continue to honor a legacy of a misguided former member of Congress who spearheaded the enactment of racist and exclusionary policies against people in our diverse community.

I join the Chinese Historical Society of America, Chinese for Affirmative Action, and the broad coalition of community organizations throughout the City and County of San Francisco and beyond in calling for the Recreation and Park Commission to remove Julius Kahn's name from the playground.

Sincerely,



Phil Ting
Assemblymember, 19th District

cc: Phil Ginsburg, General Manager
Recreation and Park Department





Capital Planning Committee

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
MAY 30 AM 11:44
BY [Signature]
837-
elep 1c
c-pages

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

May 16, 2018

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

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

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

Regarding: (1) Recommendation on the FY2018-19 and FY2019-20 General Fund
Department Capital Budget

Naomi Kelly

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on May 14, 2018, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) approved the following action item to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendations are set forth below.

1. Board File Number: TBD

Recommendation on the FY2018-19 and FY2019-20 General Fund Department Capital Budget totaling \$533 million.

Recommendation: Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the General Fund Department Capital Budget at the proposed level of \$533 million, recognizing the policy decision still to be made regarding the FiberSF line item, funded at \$3.35 million in FY2018-19.

Comments: CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 9-0, with one abstention. With unanimous support for fully funding the Capital Plan-recommended level for the General Fund Pay-As-You-Go Program, CPC acknowledged the approaching hearing on the FiberSF municipal broadband project scheduled for Budget and Finance Subcommittee Thursday, May 17, 2018, and the associated policy decision to be made between the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in light of that hearing.

Committee members or representatives in favor: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator; Andrea Bruss, Board President London Breed's Office; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works; Kaitlyn Connors, San Francisco International Airport; Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, Recreation and Parks; Ed Reiskin, Director, SFMTA; John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department; and Kathy How, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Kelly Kirkpatrick, Mayor's Budget Director, abstained.

Comments (continued):

This recommendation and vote followed a robust discussion regarding the FiberSF project and a motion to reserve recommendation for the \$3.35 million proposed for that project pending the outcome of the upcoming hearing referenced above. That motion was defeated in a 5-5 vote.



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

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 T 415.554.3155
 F 415.554.3161
 TTY 415.554.3488

May 25, 2018

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

RE: Notice of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Correction of an Error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 through Fiscal Year 2021-2022, Adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018 by Resolution No. 18-0054

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

In accordance with section 8B.125 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, the SFPUC "shall set rates, fees and other charges in connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days of submission – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 30 days the rates shall become effective without further action."

The SFPUC is submitting the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's May 22, 2018, Resolution No. 18-0091 for the correction of an error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 through Fiscal Year 2021-2022, adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018 by Resolution No. 18-0054. The anticipated effective date of adopted rates is July 1, 2018.

Please find attached copies of the following documents relating to this rates action by the Commission:

1. SFPUC Resolution No. 18-0091
2. SFPUC Agenda Item for Resolution No. 18-0091, including CEQA Statutory Exemption Request and Planning Department Concurrence

Should you have any questions, please contact Eric Sandler, SFPUC Chief Financial Officer, at 415-934-5707.

Sincerely,

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 General Manager

Mark Farrell
 Mayor

Ike Kwon
 President

Vince Courtney
 Vice President

Ann Moller Caen
 Commissioner

Francesca Vietor
 Commissioner

Anson Moran
 Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 General Manager

OUR MISSION: To provide our customers with high-quality, efficient and reliable water, power and sewer services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care.



BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 30, 2018
To: Members of the Board of Supervisors
From: ~~APC~~ Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
Correction of an Error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for
FY2018-2019 through FY2021-2022

On May 29, 2018, the Office of the Clerk of the Board received a recently adopted “Correction of an Error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service rates for FY2018-2019 and FY2021-2022” from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. (Resolution 18-0054, dated May 22, 2018.)

Under San Francisco Charter Section 8B.125, the SFPUC “shall set rates, fees and charges in connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days of submission (June 28, 2018) – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board fails to act within 30 days, the rates shall become effective without further action.”

If you would like to hold a hearing on this matter, please let me know in writing by 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 6, 2018.

c: Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
Andres Power - Mayor’s Legislative Liaison

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

City and County of San Francisco

RESOLUTION NO.: 18-0091

WHEREAS, On April 10, 2018, by Resolution No. 18-0054, this Commission adopted the new four-year schedule of rates for wastewater service in San Francisco, to take effect on or after July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Both the April 10, 2018 Commission staff report on the proposed new wastewater rates and the Proposition 218 Notice mailed to all wastewater account holders included a new fixed monthly service charge to be imposed on both residential and nonresidential wastewater customers starting July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Schedule A of the Wastewater Service Rates schedules, attached to Resolution No. 18-0054, properly included the fixed monthly service charge for residential customers, but staff inadvertently failed to include the same fixed monthly service charge for nonresidential customers in Schedule B, which was also attached to Resolution No. 18-0054; and


WHEREAS, SFPUC staff seeks the Commission's approval to correct Schedule B of the Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022 to include the previously proposed fixed monthly service charge for nonresidential customers to take effect July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, On March 26, 2018, the Planning Department determined that the adoption of wastewater rates by this Commission is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 and this action is a clarification of this Commission's approval action on April 10, 2018 in Resolution No. 18-0054; now, therefore, be it


RESOLVED, That this Commission hereby approves correcting Schedule B of the Wastewater Service Rates attached to Resolution No. 18-0054, adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018, to include a fixed monthly service charge, effective on or after July 1, 2018, in the following amounts: \$0.98 in FYE 19, \$2.19 in FYE 20, \$3.60 in FYE 21, and \$5.21 in FYE 22; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the fixed monthly service fee in corrected Schedule B shall remain in effect until repealed, modified or superseded.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its meeting of May 22, 2018.



Secretary, Public Utilities Commission



AGENDA ITEM

Public Utilities Commission

City and County of San Francisco



DEPARTMENT Financial Services AGENDA NO. 11
 MEETING DATE May 22, 2018

Public Hearing: Approve correction to Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022, adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018, to include a monthly service charge for nonresidential customers of the Wastewater Enterprise.

Project Manager: Charles Perl

Summary of Proposed Commission Action:	Public Hearing: Approve correction of an error in Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022, adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018 by Resolution No. 18-0054, to include a monthly service charge for nonresidential customers of the Wastewater Enterprise. The Approval Action of Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022 for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, occurred on April 10, 2018.
Background:	<p>On April 10, 2018, by Resolution No. 18-0054, the Commission adopted a new four-year schedule of rates and charges for wastewater service in San Francisco to take effect on or after July 1, 2018. The Proposition 218 mailed notice sent to all SFPUC ratepayers in advance of the April 10 hearing included a proposed new fixed monthly wastewater service charge to be charged to both residential and nonresidential wastewater customers. The Commission staff report for the April 10th agenda item also included the following language regarding the proposed new fixed monthly charge to be imposed on both residential and nonresidential wastewater customers:</p> <p><i>Fixed Monthly Wastewater Service Charge: Staff proposes imposing a new fixed monthly service charge to cover costs related to customer service and billing, which total 3% of the wastewater revenue requirement. The service charge is the same for all customers, as billing and customer service costs are the same regardless of meter size. This service charge provides a stable revenue source that is not affected by demand changes, supporting revenue sufficiency for the SFPUC and predictability for customers. To smooth bill impacts from this change, especially for low-water users who will see the largest percentage impact from the introduction of a fixed charge, staff proposes phasing in the fixed charge over the four-year period. The monthly service charge will rise from \$0.98 in FYE 2019 to \$5.21 in FYE 2022, when it reaches the full 3% of revenue allocation. It should be noted that the addition of this fixed charge offsets reductions to variable charge cost recovery, so this billing change is revenue neutral.</i></p> <p>Commission Resolution No. 18-0054 approving the wastewater rates and charges on April 10 incorporated an attached schedule of fees. The new monthly service</p>

APPROVAL: _____
 COMMISSION SECRETARY Donna Hood

**Approve correction to Schedule B of Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022, previously adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018, by Resolution No. 18-0054, to add a monthly service charge for nonresidential customers of the Wastewater Enterprise.
Commission Meeting Date: May 22, 2018**

	charge for <i>residential</i> customers was listed in Schedule A, but staff inadvertently failed to include the very same monthly service charge for <i>nonresidential</i> customers in Schedule B. The purpose of this agenda item is to correct that inadvertent omission from Schedule B.
Environmental Review:	On March 26, 2018, the Planning Department determined that the action to adopt wastewater rates is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges. This exemption was reviewed and considered by this Commission in its approval to adopt wastewater rates on April 10, 2018. The action proposed herein is to clarify an omission in this Commission’s Resolution No. 18-0054. The Approval Action for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code occurred on April 10, 2018 under this Commission’s Resolution No. 18-0054.
Results of Inaction:	A delay or denial in approving this agenda item will result in no fixed charge being billed to nonresidential wastewater customers starting July 1, 2018, and will adversely impact the SFPUC’s ability to meet projected revenue requirements for the Wastewater Enterprise.
Recommendation:	SFPUC staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached resolution.
Attachments:	

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

City and County of San Francisco

RESOLUTION NO.: 18-0091

WHEREAS, On April 10, 2018, by Resolution No. 18-0054, this Commission adopted the new four-year schedule of rates for wastewater service in San Francisco, to take effect on or after July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Both the April 10, 2018 Commission staff report on the proposed new wastewater rates and the Proposition 218 Notice mailed to all wastewater account holders included a new fixed monthly service charge to be imposed on both residential and nonresidential wastewater customers starting July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Schedule A of the Wastewater Service Rates schedules, attached to Resolution No. 18-0054, properly included the fixed monthly service charge for residential customers, but staff inadvertently failed to include the same fixed monthly service charge for nonresidential customers in Schedule B, which was also attached to Resolution No. 18-0054; and

WHEREAS, SFPUC staff seeks the Commission's approval to correct Schedule B of the Wastewater Service Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022 to include the previously proposed fixed monthly service charge for nonresidential customers to take effect July 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, On March 26, 2018, the Planning Department determined that the adoption of wastewater rates by this Commission is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 and this action is a clarification of this Commission's approval action on April 10, 2018 in Resolution No. 18-0054; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That this Commission hereby approves correcting Schedule B of the Wastewater Service Rates attached to Resolution No. 18-0054, adopted by the Commission on April 10, 2018, to include a fixed monthly service charge, effective on or after July 1, 2018, in the following amounts: \$0.98 in FYE 19, \$2.19 in FYE 20, \$3.60 in FYE 21, and \$5.21 in FYE 22; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the fixed monthly service fee in corrected Schedule B shall remain in effect until repealed, modified or superseded.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its meeting of May 22, 2018.

Secretary, Public Utilities Commission

From: [Kern, Chris \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Revelli, Lindsay \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [Johnston, Timothy \(CPC\)](#); [Torrey, Irina \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: RE: SFPUC CEQA Statutory Exemption Request - Wastewater Rates FYE 2019 thru FYE 2022
Date: Monday, March 26, 2018 10:01:38 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Lindsay, the Planning Department has determined that the Proposal to Adopt Retail Wastewater Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022 is statutorily exempt from environmental review in accordance with CEQA section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges.

Chris Kern, Principal Planner
Environmental Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9037 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Revelli, Lindsay [mailto:LRevelli@sfgwater.org]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Kern, Chris (CPC)
Cc: Johnston, Timothy (CPC); Bordon, Rhia (CPC)
Subject: SFPUC CEQA Statutory Exemption Request - Wastewater Rates FYE 2019 thru FYE 2022

Hi Chris – Please find attached for your review the Statutory Exemption Request for the Proposal to Adopt Retail Wastewater Rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Thanks very much,

Lindsay

Lindsay Lane Revelli
Environmental Project Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Bureau of Environmental Management
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
D 415-554-1823 F 415-934-5750





March 22, 2018

Mr. Chris Kern, Senior Environmental Planner
 Environmental Planning Division
 San Francisco Planning Department
 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
 San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: CEQA Statutory Exemption Request
 Proposal to Adopt Retail Wastewater Rates
 FYE 2019 through FYE 2022

Dear Chris:

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposes adoption of wastewater rates for retail wastewater service in San Francisco and suburban areas during the Fiscal Year Ending 2019 through Fiscal Year Ending 2022 to become effective July 1, 2018, July 1, 2019, July 1, 2020, and July 1, 2021. The SFPUC Bureau of Environmental Management requests Environmental Planning (EP) concurrence that the proposed adoption of rates is statutorily exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The SFPUC recommends the proposed adoption of rates by the Commission is statutorily exempt from CEQA under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges.

As required by the City & County of San Francisco Charter, the SFPUC retains an independent rate consultant at least every five years to evaluate the cost of service of the retail water and sewer systems, and to recommend appropriate rate structures. This rate study is an engineering and financial exercise that provides an administrative record to satisfy the legal requirements of California's Proposition 218 and the City Charter. The rate study ultimately provides the basis and rationale for proposed water and wastewater rates supported by a cost of service analysis.

Mark Farrell
 Mayor

Ike Kwon
 President

Vince Courtney
 Vice President

Ann Moller Caen
 Commissioner

Francesca Vietor
 Commissioner

Anson Moran
 Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 General Manager



Additionally, the updated Ratepayer Assurance Policy adopted by the Commission on the September 12, 2017, set the following principles to guide the development of rates and charges:

- Revenue Sufficiency
- Customer Equity
- Environmental Sustainability
- Affordability
- Predictability
- Simplicity

This wastewater rates proposal was developed based on these principles, and the rate design policy decisions reference the tradeoffs inherent in the rate-setting process, as required by the Ratepayer Assurance Policy. The proposed wastewater service rates have been reviewed by the Rate Fairness Board and have benefitted from extensive public outreach.

SFPUC staff has determined rate increases are necessary to maintain revenue sufficiency and to meet operational goals. Over the next four years, FYE 2019 through FYE 2022, staff proposes to raise rates such that the average single family wastewater bill increases by 8.3% annually. Additionally, staff proposes the following rate design changes:

1. Creation of a fixed monthly service charge which is phased over a four year period
2. Implementation of a temporary drought surcharge. A temporary surcharge would only be implemented if the Commission were to declare a drought and implement the Water Shortage Allocation Plan and would only recover the cost of service.

The last water and wastewater rate study was completed in 2014 and supported rates for the four-year period beginning FY 2014-15 through FY 2017-18. While the past few years focused on the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) progress, the next four years supports the completion of WSIP, as well as the beginning of major portions of the Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) and continued water and sewer main replacement.

Mr. Chris Kern, Senior Environmental Planner
Environmental Planning Division, San Francisco Planning Department
CEQA Statutory Exemption Request
Proposal to Adopt Retail Wastewater Rates FYE 2019 through FYE 2022
March 22, 2018
Page 3


Pursuant to Charter Section 16.112, a Notice of Public Hearing on the establishment of a schedule of rates was published in the official newspaper on March 12th through March 18th, 2018, and posted on the SFPUC website and at the San Francisco Public Library, for a public hearing on April 10, 2018, with possible Commission action on this date. If approved by the Commission, these rates and charges will be subject to rejection by the Board of Supervisors (BOS), as provided in Charter section 8B.125, within 30 days following notification to the BOS. If approved, these proposed retail wastewater rates will become effective July 1, 2018 and will remain effective until revised.

CEQA COMPLIANCE/RECOMMENDATION

The SFPUC recommends the proposed adoption of wastewater rates for FYE 2019 through FYE 2022 is statutorily exempt from environmental review under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges), Subsection (a)(1) which provides a statutory exemption from CEQA for the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public agencies for the purposes of meeting operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits.

Thank you for your concurrence with this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Irina P. Torrey". The signature is written in a cursive style and is enclosed within a hand-drawn oval.

Irina P. Torrey, AICP, Bureau Manager

Cc: Charles Perl, SFPUC Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Timothy Johnston, MP, Environmental Planner, Environmental Planning
Division, San Francisco Planning Department
Lindsay Revelli, Environmental Project Manager, SFPUC Bureau of
Environmental Management

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2018 1:18 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: 12B Waiver Request
Attachments: 20180531092719235.pdf

From: Zadlo, Erin (HRD)
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2018 9:54 AM
To: WaiverRequest, CMD (ADM) <cmd.waiverrequest@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: 12B Waiver Request

The attached document contains a 12B waiver request and justification. Please let me know if you require any additional information.

Thank you,



Connecting People with Purpose

Erin Zadlo, Senior Human Resources Analyst

Department of Human Resources
One South Van Ness Ave., 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 551-8947
Website: www.sfdhr.org

City and County of San Francisco
Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director



Department of Human Resources
Connecting People with Purpose
www.sfdhr.org

May 30, 2018

Tamra Winchester, Director
General Services Agency - Contract Monitoring Division
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Winchester:

I respectfully request that the Human Rights Commission grant a waiver of Chapter 12B requirements (Equal Benefits Ordinance) to use the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway to provide lodging for the Fire Department's Inspector Examination raters.

Examination ratings will be conducted over a 4-day period in July and August 2018 at the Department of Human Resources Testing Center. The raters will consist of 28 subject matter experts from fire departments who have been recruited nationwide to provide unbiased examination ratings. Lodging is required to provide accommodations for the experts during the ratings.

The Holiday Inn Golden Gateway best meets our requirements for this event as the only 12B compliant hotel, The Whitcomb, has a history of health and safety issues. The Holiday Inn Golden Gateway provides the most cost-effective accommodations, encourages rater participation, offers the most attractive alternative for important out-of-town guests and contributes to future rater recruitments. In addition, the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway has positive reviews and no reports regarding health and safety issues, e.g., pest infestations. This hotel has been attempting to become 12B compliant, but has thus far been unable to do so because of its corporate affiliation:

The waiver request form for the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway is enclosed. I appreciate your favorable consideration of this request. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Erin Zadlo, Public Safety Team at (415) 551-8947.

Sincerely,

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONTRACT MONITORING DIVISION

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

Send completed waiver requests to:
CMD, 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 200, San Francisco, CA 94102 or
cmd.waiverrequest@sfgov.org

FOR CMD USE ONLY
Request Number:

Section 1. CCSF Department Information (all fields must be completed)

Department Head Signature: [Signature] 5/30/18
Name of Department: Department of Human Resources
Department Address: 1 South Van Ness Ave., 4th floor
Contact Person: Erin Zadlo
Phone Number: 415-551-8947 E-mail: erin.zadlo@sfgov.org

Section 2. Contractor Information (all fields must be completed)

Contractor Name: Holiday Inn Golden Gateway
Bidder/Supplier No.: 0340 Contractor Tax ID:
Contractor Address: 1500 Van Ness Ave.
Contact Person: Ru Paster Contact Phone No.: 415-447-3021

Section 3. Transaction Information (all fields must be completed)

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 5/30/2018 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$4,555.55
Contract/Transaction Number: Contract Name:
Contract/Transaction Start Date: 7/30/2018 Contract/Transaction End Date: 8/30/2018

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

[x] Chapter 12B
Chapter 14B Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements will still be in force even when a 14B Waiver Type A or B is granted.

Section 5. Waiver Type (a justification must be attached; see Check List on the other side of this form for instructions)

A. Sole Source
B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or §21.15)
C. Public Entity
[x] D. No Potential Contractors Comply (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 5/30/2018
E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
F. Sham/Shell Entity (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
G. Subcontracting Goals
H. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) Note: For contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7(J)(2)

CMD ACTION - For CMD/HRC Use Only
12B Waiver Granted: 14B Waiver Granted:
12B Waiver Denied: 14B Waiver Denied:
Reason for Action:
CMD or HRC Staff: Date:
CMD or HRC Director: Date:



OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR



Mark E. Farrell, Mayor
Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department Heads
City Financial Officers
Contracting Officers

FROM: Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator *N. Kelly*

CC: Jaci Fong, Purchaser and Director of Office of Contract Administration
Clair Farley, Executive Director, Office of Transgender Initiatives

SUBJECT: Ban on City Contracts and Travel to States with Anti-LGBT Laws -
Oklahoma added to list of Covered States.

DATE: June 4, 2018

On October 14, 2016, the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance No. 189-16 (file No. 160425) ("Ordinance") which places a ban on city-funded travel and City contracts involving States with anti-LGBT laws. The Ordinance under Administrative Code Section 12X.5(a) declares that the City shall not enter into any Contract with a Contractor that has its United States headquarters in a state on the Covered State List or where any or all of the work on the Contract will be performed in a state on the Covered State List.

Generally:

The Ordinance bans all travel to states on the list of Covered States below. Furthermore, the City shall not enter into any Contract with a Contractor that has its headquarters in a state on the Covered State List or where any or all of the work on the Contract will be performed in a state on the Covered State list. Unless otherwise exempted, this contracting ban applies to all contracts entered into by the City (See Administrative Code Sec. 12X.5(b) for specific circumstances where the Ordinance is not applicable, exempted, or eligible for a waiver). However, please note that the contracting ban only applies to the prime contractor and does not extend to lower tier subcontractors, suppliers, or vendors. In addition, the Ordinance only applies to contracts that were first advertised, solicited, or initiated on or after February 11, 2017 and therefore does not apply to amendments to pre-existing contracts.

The following state will be added to the Covered State List based on recent legislative action meeting the definition above:

- Oklahoma:
 - SB 1140 allows private adoption and foster agencies to reject qualified LGBTQ adoptive or foster parents based on the agency's religious beliefs. SB 1140 also prohibits the Oklahoma Department of Human Services from denying or revoking an



agency's license, and prohibits a state or local government entity from denying a grant or contract to an agency, based on its refusal to participate in the placement of a child that violates its policies SB 1140 was signed into law on May 11, 2018, and becomes effective November 1, 2018.

- The addition of Oklahoma to the Covered State List will be effective on November 1, 2018.

The list below indicates all the states currently on the Covered State List:

- Alabama (effective 6/30/2017)
- Kansas (effective 2/11/2017)
- Kentucky (effective 6/30/2017)
- Mississippi (effective 2/11/2017)
- North Carolina (effective 2/11/2017)
- **Oklahoma (effective 11/1/2018)**
- South Dakota (effective 3/14/2017)
- Tennessee (effective 2/11/2017)
- Texas (effective 9/1/2017)

Ensuring Compliance with the Section 12X.5(a) Prohibition:

Any department initiating a contract should be aware of the ban, and should not submit contracts for review that violate Section 12X.5(a). If the contract is subject to approval from the Office of Contract Administration (OCA), OCA will review all new purchases and Professional Services Contracts (PSC) under Chapter 21 to ensure they comply with the Section 12X.5(a) prohibition. Likewise, departments with Chapter 6 contracting authority or other independent contracting authority (e.g. Prop Q) should establish procedures to review/ensure compliance with the Section 12X.5(a) prohibition. As previously advised, Departments are expected to notify vendors of the Chapter 12X ban in Request for Proposals, Request for Qualifications, or other related bid documents.

The following language should be included with your solicitations/contract documents:

"This Contract is subject to the requirements of Administrative Code Chapter 12X, which prohibits the City from entering into contracts with companies headquartered in states with laws that perpetuate discrimination against LGBT populations or where any or all of the work on the contract will be performed in any of those states. Bidders are hereby advised that Bidders, which have their United States headquarters in a state on the Covered State List, as that term is defined in Administrative Code Section 12X.3, or where any or all of the work on the contract will be performed in a state on the Covered State List may not enter into contracts with the City. A list of states on the Covered State List is available at the website of the City Administrator. I certify that my company is headquartered at the following address _____ . I will notify the City if my company's headquarters moves."

Non-applicability, Exceptions, and Waivers:

If a department wishes to enter into a contract otherwise prohibited by Chapter 12X, a department may make a determination of non-applicability, exception, or waiver as authorized by Section 12X.5(b). If a department makes a determination under Section 12X.5(b), they must record the

determination, summarizing the Contract and the basis for inapplicability. The form is available on the intranet as the Form P-12X.5. Below are the exceptions listed within the ordinance which allows business headquartered in states on the banned list to enter into new contracts with the City:

- Needed services are available only from one source.
- Contract is necessary to respond to an emergency which endangers public health or safety and no compliant company is immediately able to perform required services.
- There are no compliant/qualified responsive bidders and the Contract is for a service, project or property that is essential to the City or public.
- Public interest warrants the granting of a waiver because application would have an adverse impact on services or a substantial adverse financial impact on the City.
- Services to be purchased are available under a bulk purchasing agreement with a federal, state or local government entity or a group purchasing organization, which will substantially reduce the City's cost.
- Violates or inconsistent with the terms or conditions of a grant, subvention, or agreement with a public agency, provided that the contracting officer has made a good faith attempt to change the terms or conditions.

For purchases submitted for review to OCA that require a determination in order to contract with a company banned by Chapter 12X, a copy of the Form P-12X.5 must be included in the routing packet. There is an additional set of exceptions which refer to travel. If there are questions related to travel, please reach out to the Office of the Controller.

For purchases not reviewed by OCA that require a determination in order to contract with a company banned by Chapter 12X, departments must make a determination, and retain a copy of the Form P-12X.5 as part of the contract file.

Further, in accordance with Section 12X.5(c), each Contracting Department shall maintain any determinations made under Section 12.X.5(b) and submit a report (within 30 days of the end of the fiscal year) to the City Administrator of those records.

The Covered State List is reviewed on a semiannual basis. When a state is removed or added the Office of the City Administrator will make that information public and post the updated list on its website, available at <http://sfgsa.org/chapter-12x-anti-lgbt-state-ban-list>.

Should you have any questions on these policies or the legislation, please do not hesitate to contact my office or Clair Farley at the Office of Transgender Initiatives at transcitysf@sfgov.org. Routine requests about contracting should be directed to Jaci Fong, Purchaser at (415) 554-6743 or oca@sfgov.org for Chapter 21 contracts.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 11:42 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: 6/5/2018 SFMTA Board Meeting to Consider Amending Transportation Code Div. II, Art. 900 - Amend RPP
Attachments: SFMTA Ltr 6.4.18.pdf

From: :) [mailto:gumby5@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 12:04 AM
To: MTABoard@SFMTA.com
Cc: Boomer, Roberta (MTA) <Roberta.Boomer@sfmta.com>; Reiskin, Ed (MTA) <Ed.Reiskin@sfmta.com>; Studwell, Kathryn (MTA) <Kathryn.Studwell@sfmta.com>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MayorMarkFarrell (MYR) <mayormarkfarrell@sfgov.org>
Subject: 6/5/2018 SFMTA Board Meeting to Consider Amending Transportation Code Div. II, Art. 900 - Amend RPP

SFMTA Board Chairman Brinkman, Vice Chairman Meinecke and Members of the Board:
Please see attached from Jordan Park Improvement Association (JPIA).
Apologies for any duplication.
Thank you.
Sincerely,
Rose Hillson for Larry Costello, President

JORDAN PARK IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

June 4, 2018

Dear SFMTA Board Chairman Cheryl Brinkman, Vice Chairman Malcolm Heinicke and Members of the Board,

The Jordan Park Improvement Association (JPIA) opposes the installation of any features associated with "PAY" parking on our streets. Specifically, we do not support the installation of meter boxes or individual meters with accompanying signs, as in the "Paid + Permit" parking proposal to be voted on at your June 5, 2018 Board Meeting.

The streets encompassing Jordan Park are Palm, Jordan, Commonwealth and Parker Avenues (between California and Geary), and Euclid Ave. (between Parker and Palm).

JPIA requests that Jordan Park be exempt from the new "Paid + Permit" proposal — which is an amendment to the existing Residential Permit Program (RPP).

We respectfully submit this request for your approval. Thank you.

Sincerely,



L. R. Costello, President
Jordan Park Improvement Association
146 Jordan Ave.
San Francisco, CA
415225-5567

Cc:
Ed Reiskin, Director of SFMTA
Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board
Mayor Mark Farrell

From: zrants <zrants@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 10:11 PM
To: Boomer, Roberta (MTA); Reiskin, Ed (MTA)
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Cohen, Malia (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Opposition to Amending the Transportation Code Division II Article 900

June 5, 2018

To the SFMTA Board, cc the Board of Supervisors:

re: Item 11, SFMTA Board Meeting, June 5, 2018
Opposition to Amending the Transportation Code Division II Article 900.

I would like to raise these issues as to why I feel this is a bad idea.

1. Previously filed Residential Parking Permit (RPP) applications should be exempted from any amendments to the current rules. Allowing changes after the applications are filed shows bad faith on the part of the department and gives them incentive to hold up applications.

2. SFMTA recently initiated pilot parking projects in Bernal Heights and Dogpatch. Problems with those projects were raised today. Until those projects are completed and an analysis made to determine whether the changes work as intended, and the neighbors feel comfortable with the results, none of the elements being tested in those pilot projects should be written into code amendments. The point of running a test is to get the results before making changes. *I believe this issue was raised by the SFMTA CAC at the meeting I attended on the pilot parking projects on Bernal Heights.*

3. Under the new spirit of cooperation that the Board of Supervisors expects from the SFMTA, residents should remain the initiators of the parking plans in their neighborhoods and design their parking plans. This should include where to place the RPP spots and the time limits. Residents and workers know our streets and our needs best. SFMTA needs to show us respect if they want our trust.

4. SFMTA sets up pilot projects for corporate entities, such as bike and scooter shares to try to accommodate them. They should offer the same options for residents when they propose a test project. To deny citizens the same options that corporate entities enjoy may be construed as discrimination.

5. A major reason for establishing residential parking permit areas is to keep commuters from parking in residential areas, not to keep workers and visitors out. The rule about moving a block or 100 feet away after the time limit should be rescinded, or a test set up to see if some of the visitor and worker problems are not resolved. This is a difficult to understand rule that annoys people. If someone spends a little time over the limit and only has to move their car to prove they are not sitting on a spot all day. You remove the commuters but not the workers and visitors.

6. SFMTA acknowledges some Vehicle-sharing services like City CarShare and Scoot are affecting the residential parking areas, but ignores a lot of the most pervasive ones, like Uber, Lyft, tech busses, automated

vehicles, shuttles, and bike stands, that are taking over our streets and sidewalks. If you want to solve the parking problem for residents, you have to put a hold on expanding private parking permits In RPP areas.

7. SFMTA should put a halt to converting any additional public parking spots to corporate parking spots on residential sidewalks and streets that have RPP applications on file.

8. The supervisors should request an audit on the private contracts that have converted much of the parking from public to private corporate use prior to any further conversions. What are the results of replacing private vehicles with shared ones? Is the air any cleaner? Have we reduced traffic congestion? Has public transportation use increased? We don't need to continue to go down the same path without any accounting for the results. We do not live in 2025. We live in 2018. We need a functioning system today.

9. SFMTA calls it streamlining, but, the public believes there are major alterations in these amendments that go beyond streamlining. Under the proposed revisions, the SFMTA can propose and the SFMTA Board can "designate, rescind, or modify" RPP areas. We don't believe the SFMTA currently has that power, so the effect of the amendments is to move the power to create RPPs from the citizens to the SFMTA. We consider this a significant change that needs Supervisor review.

10. Our supervisors should support our requests since they claim they want the SFMTA to work with us from the ground up instead of managing us from the top down. This is their chance to make that happen.

11. Ordinance 180089 allows the Board of Supervisors to review RPP decisions if the public opposes them. If this Amendment in the Transportation code is not taken up, individual neighborhood decisions on RPP applications may be.

12. A number of public comments and letters set the stage for opposition to Amendments to the Transportation Code Division II Article 900 today. We shall soon see how well the new Ordinance works to convince the SFMTA to work with the public.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza, concerned citizen

)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 11:35 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Family Council at St. Luke's Hospital - concerns re transfer to Davies
Attachments: Ltr to CPMC ltr 6-1-18.pdf

From: Patients Are First [mailto:patientsarefirst@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2018 6:30 AM
To: Bumatay, Susan <bumatas@sutterhealth.org>; Anderson, Joshua <andersjx@sutterhealth.org>; Scott Ciesielski, MS, RN <ciesies@sutterhealth.org>
Cc: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR) <mayormarkfarrell@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Goossen, Carolyn (BOS) <carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; health.commission.dph@sfdph.org; bnadell@sanfranciscoltombudsman.org; Macksood, James <MacksoJ@sutterhealth.org>; orda@sutterhealth.org; Cong, Liz <conge@sutterhealth.org>; Melissa White <whitemf@sutterhealth.org>; Garcia, Barbara (DPH) <barbara.garcia@sfdph.org>; Dr. Warren Browner, CEO <brownew@sutterhealth.org>; Sarah Krevans, CEO <krevans@sutterhealth.org>; Morewitz, Mark (DPH) <mark.morewitz@sfdph.org>; Meyer, Catherine (BOS) <cathy.mulkeymeyer@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Council at St. Luke's Hospital - concerns re transfer to Davies

Dear Ms. Bumatay, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Ciesielski:

Attached is a letter from the Family Council at St. Luke's Hospital.

Raquel Rivera
Family Council Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital Sub-Acute & Skilled Nursing Facility
[\(415\) 273-9883](tel:4152739883)



FAMILY COUNCIL
St. Luke's Sub-Acute & Skilled Nursing Facility

June 1, 2018

Via Email

Susan Bumatay (bumatas@sutterhealth.org)
Executive Director, Care Management, Bay Area
Sutter Health CPMC

Josh Anderson (andersjx@sutterhealth.org)
Director of Nursing, Davies Campus
Sutter Health CPMC

Scott Ciesielski (ciesies@sutterhealth.org)
Chief Nurse Executive
Sutter Health CPMC

RE: St. Luke's Sub-Acute and Skilled Nursing Unit

Dear Ms. Bumatay, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Ciesielski:

On behalf of the families of the subacute unit, the Family Council requests the following:

1. Individualized detailed transfer plan, in writing to each family, at least 30 days prior to transfer;
2. Guided facility tour for all families at least 30 days prior to transfer;
3. Attendance of CPMC directors at a Family Council meeting to discuss general transfer plans.

Families have concerns about the move to Davies and we ask for your written response to the following questions:

1. How will CPMC ensure the safety of the subacute patients when they are in the activities room given our concern that it cannot be seen from the nurses' station?

2. How does CPMC plan to use the activities room for both the subacute and SNF patients?
3. What are the plans to ensure that the subacute patients are in a safe environment? For example, will an alarm system be implemented for the patients? If so, please explain.
4. How does CPMC plan to overcome the language barriers of activity staff, none of whom, we understand, speak a second language to address our Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese speaking residents?

We understand that in addition to high quality nursing care, activity staff have a great impact on the quality of life of our loved ones. The attention and distraction they provide can only be achieved in an environment where individuals know each resident's needs and what brings them comfort.

As Josh Anderson, Susan Bumatay, Emie Maninang and others at CPMC are well aware, the families continue to ask that Carmen Escobar, the activities coordinator at St. Luke's, be transferred to Davies to continue her work in activities for as long as subacute patients reside there. Carmen understands every patient's needs and knows their comforts. Her years of experience caring for the patients in the subacute unit cannot be replaced. She has been with the majority of the patients since they were admitted. The families have a sense of comfort and relief knowing she genuinely cares about the patients and is committed to their well-being and care. As Dr. Browner stated at the last Board of Supervisors hearing, it is not about money. Since it is a non-union position and it's not about money, we ask you to help us understand why Carmen Escobar should not be transferred to Davies with the other patients, as we understand Emie is. The families request that CPMC reconsider its decision, and transfers Carmen as the dedicated full-time activities coordinator for the subacute unit on a permanent basis.

Please respond to this letter by June 11, 2018. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Raquel Rivera
Family Council Coordinator
(415) 273-9883
patientsarefirst@gmail.com

Sutter Health CPMC

June 1, 2018

Page 3

cc: Sarah Krevans, CEO, Sutter Health
Dr. Warren Browner, CEO California Pacific Medical Center
Mayor Mark Farrell
SF Board of Supervisors
SF Health Commission
Director Barbara Garcia, Department of Public Health
Benson Nadell, Ombudsman
Liz Cong
Jim Macksood
Melissa White
Austin Ord

From: Reports, Controller (CON)
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 1:30 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Elliott, Jason (MYR); Leung, Sally (MYR); Whitehouse, Melissa (MYR); Tsang, Francis; Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Tucker, John (MYR); Hussey, Deirdre (MYR); Canale, Ellen (MYR); Power, Andres (MYR); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Newman, Debra (BUD); Rose, Harvey (BUD); CON-EVERYONE; Docs, SF (LIB)
Subject: Issued: Recreation and Parks Structural Maintenance Yard improves blueprint review process for new and renovated park facilities

The Controller's Office City Performance Unit's Lean Team has issued a report summarizing the process improvement work resulting from a project with the Recreation and Parks Department's Structural Maintenance Yard.

In June 2017, the Recreation and Parks Structural Maintenance Yard worked with the City Performance Lean Team to improve the review of plans for new and renovated park facilities. The team improved the process by:

- Developed a standard process for comprehensive and regular plan reviews, including plan review timelines and a clear mechanism to ensure that all feedback is thoroughly addressed;
- Created a tracking board that allows Structural Maintenance supervisors and management to see clearly which shops have not yet completed plan review;
- Developed standard templates for meeting agendas and notetaking during meetings

These improvements resulted in the team increasing the percentage of time that plans are sufficiently reviewed and marked up from 47% in June 2017 to 82% in February 2018.

To view the summary, please visit: <http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2585>

For more information, visit the City Performance Lean Program website at: <https://cityperformancelleanprogram.weebly.com/>

For questions about the summary, please contact Ryan Hunter at ryan.hunter@sfgov.org or 415-554-7533.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 1:46 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: 30 year SF residents asking you to support....

From: Karen Gray [mailto:karen@gradient.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 9:23 AM
To: Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; don@gradient.org
Subject: 30 year SF residents asking you to support....

The renovation of the Mission Branch of the SF Public Library.

Karen has volunteered at the library for 5 years in the Children's section. A very popular, well-used children's library that needs care and attention.

The library is in dire need for a renovation. Please support the funding of our community library renovation!

Don and Karen Gray
926 Sanchez Street
SF 94114



From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 8:52 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Letter from TEROC in support of Proposition E
Attachments: Prop E Letter TEROC.pdf

From: Ong, Michael M.D. [mailto:MOng@mednet.ucla.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 8:28 AM
To: BreedStaff, (BOS) <breedstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter from TEROC in support of Proposition E

Dear President Breed,

Please find enclosed a letter on behalf of the State of California Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee in support of Proposition E.

Best,

m

Michael Ong, M.D. Ph.D.
Chair, State of California Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee
Associate Professor in Residence
UCLA and VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System

UCLA HEALTH SCIENCES IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
TOBACCO EDUCATION AND RESEARCH OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MEMBERS:

MICHAEL ONG, M.D., Ph.D.
CHAIRPERSON
Associate Professor in Residence
Division of General Internal Medicine and
Health Services Research
Department of Medicine
University of California, Los Angeles

LOURDES BAEZCONDE-GARBANATI, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.A.
Associate Dean for Community Initiatives
Professor, Preventive Medicine and Director
Center for Health Equity in the Americas
Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
Research Department of Preventive Medicine
Keck School of Medicine
University of Southern California

Mary BAUM
Senior Program Director
Social Advocates for Youth (SAY) San Diego

VICKI BAUMAN
Prevention Director II
Stanislaus County Office of Education

PRIMO J. CASTRO, M.P.A.
Director of Government Relations
American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network

PATRICIA ETEM, M.P.H.
Executive Consultant
CIVIC Communications

ALAN HENDERSON, Dr.P.H., C.H.E.S.
Professor Emeritus
California State University, Long Beach

PAMELA LING, M.D., M.P.H.
Associate Professor
Department of Medicine
University of California, San Francisco

WENDY MAX, Ph.D.
Professor and Director
Institute for Health Aging
University of California, San Francisco

ROBERT OLDHAM, M.D., M.S.H.A.
Public Health Officer and Public Health Division Director
Placer County Department of Health and Human Services

CLARADINA SOTO, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Assistant Professor
University of Southern California
Keck School of Medicine

MARK STARR, D.V.M., M.P.V.M.
Deputy Director for Environmental Health
California Department of Public Health

Edith D. Balbach, Ph.D.
Professor Emerita of Public Health and Community
Medicine
Tufts University



May 24, 2018

Re: Letter of Support for Proposition E

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I write in my capacity as chair of the Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC). TEROC is a legislatively mandated oversight committee that monitors the use of Proposition 99 and Proposition 56 tobacco tax revenues for tobacco control, prevention education, and tobacco-related research in California (Health & Safety Codes §§ 104365-104370, Rev. & Tax. Code § 30130.56(e)). TEROC advises the California Department of Public Health; the University of California; and the California Department of Education with respect to policy development, integration, and evaluation of tobacco education programs funded by Proposition 99 and Proposition 56. TEROC is also responsible for the development of a master plan for the future implementation of tobacco control and research for the State of California, and making recommendations to the Legislature.

TEROC strongly supports Proposition E, which would uphold the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' decision to prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco products, including menthol. Scientific evidence has demonstrated that flavors play a critical role in the popularity of tobacco products, especially among teens and young adults.¹ Manufacturers of flavored tobacco products aggressively target youth and young adults who already have a high preference for sweet, fruity, and candy flavored products. These flavors mask the harsh taste of tobacco, making it easier to initiate and sustain a lifelong addiction. Nationally, 70 to 80 percent of middle and high school tobacco users have used at least one flavored tobacco product in the past 30 days.² In addition, eight out of ten California young adults 18 to 24 that currently use other tobacco products reported flavor usage.

The African American population, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) population, and the youth population disproportionately smoke menthol cigarettes.¹ For California high school students, in 2016, the percentage of smokers who usually smoke menthol-flavored cigarettes was 43.6 percent. Approximately 25 to 30 percent of cigarette smokers in the U.S. smoke menthol cigarettes.^{3 4} Similar rates have been found in adult smokers in California; where 30 percent of adult smokers reported using menthol cigarettes.⁵

Californians expressed support for ending the tobacco epidemic through the passage of Proposition 56. Similarly, a majority of Californians approve eliminating the sale of menthol cigarettes with 58 percent of adults agreeing that the sale of menthol cigarettes should not be allowed.⁶ Policy interventions that ban or restrict the sale and distribution of flavored tobacco products are part of a comprehensive strategy to reduce tobacco use.

Proposition E is consistent with TEROC's 2018-2020 Master Plan, *New Challenges, New Promises for All*, **Objective 2: Eliminate Tobacco-Related Health Disparities, Objective 4: Protect Youth and Young Adults and Objective 6: Counter the Tobacco Industry**. Strategies supporting objectives 2, 4 and 6 include the adoption of policies that promote health equity such as laws that restrict the sale of menthol and flavored tobacco products in local communities. Flavored tobacco bans protect health by combating the tobacco industry's long history of predatory marketing to priority populations. **Under objectives 2, 4, and 6, TEROC strongly supports Proposition E.**

Page 2
May 24, 2018

TEROC stands with San Francisco and strongly supports all efforts to prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco products, including menthol.

Sincerely,



Michael K Ong, MD, PhD
Chairperson

References

1. The Flavor Trap: How Tobacco Companies are Luring Kids with Candy Flavored E-Cigarettes and Cigars. American Academy of Pediatrics, American Cancer Society, American Heart and Stroke Association, American Lung Association, and Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids.
2. California Department of Public Health CTCP. *California Tobacco Facts and Figures: A Retrospective Look at 2017*. In: Health CDoP, ed. Sacramento, CA 2018.
3. Curtin GM, Sulsky SI, Van Landingham C, et al. Patterns of menthol cigarette use among current smokers, overall and within demographic strata, based on data from four US government surveys. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*. 2014;70(1):189-196.
4. Jones MR, Apelberg BJ, Tellez-Plaza M, Samet JM, Navas-Acien A. Menthol cigarettes, race/ethnicity, and biomarkers of tobacco use in US adults: the 1999–2010 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers*. 2013;22(2):224-232.
5. California Tobacco Control Program. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. In. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health,; 2015.
6. California Tobacco Control Program. Online California Tobacco Survey. In. California Department of Public Health, trans. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Public Health 2017.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 8:12 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: FW: Scooter companies- a different problem

From: d [mailto:wdpriv@protonmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 7:40 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Scooter companies- a different problem

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I know you have received many complaints about scooters in SF, but I'd like to share yet another set of problems with them. Scooters are dropped in front of people's houses twice a day and this generates various problems. The scooter company has been contacted multiple times but won't change its behavior.

For the past couple of weeks, Bird has been dropping off scooters on the sidewalk in front of our house every morning and more in the afternoons

They have left them everywhere possible- lined up neatly in front of our house, in the middle of the sidewalk in front of our stairs, leaned up against our house when the kickstands are broken, and on the street. Twice in the last week- scooters were on the ground blocking the driveway so I could not pull in without getting out to move them; once, one had fallen over onto my car; four out of the last seven nights they were not picked up overnight.

Additionally, there is a whole raft of other problems. Again just in the past week, people have left various trash and a pile of starbucks cups because they couldn't carry them on the scooters, there is a lot of noise right under our window as people try to figure it out- obviously some people are quiet and some are rambunctious and others are drunk.

We have contacted Bird and they politely wrote to say that our house would be added to the "No Drop List." Additionally, several days later, I ran into the guy who was dropping them off and told him the company had promised we had been added to the No Drop List; he assured me no more would show up. That afternoon, the same guy was dropping off more against our house. They don't care.

I don't know the legality of sidewalk use, but clearly the company is saying the right things without taking corrective action. There has to be some kind of system in terms of where and how these scooters are left- and some accountability on behalf of the company. Right now, they seem to have no plan except to make it someone else's problem.

If you have any thoughts or recommendations, please let me know. We will continue to try to deal with the company directly but have already contacted them several times.

Thank you for your time,

Daniel

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

180408
180408
180408

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 1:23 PM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: The Police Commission Appointments are for the next ELECTED Mayor to make

From: tamibryant@aol.com [mailto:tamibryant@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Lee, Ivy (BOS) <ivy.lee@sfgov.org>; Boilard, Chelsea (BOS) <chelsea.boilard@sfgov.org>; Lloyd, Kayleigh (BOS) <kayleigh.lloyd@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Morales, Carolina (BOS) <carolina.morales@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>
Subject: The Police Commission Appointments are for the next ELECTED Mayor to make

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please take my email as my testimony as I cannot miss work to come to City Hall.

First, like you all, I am mourning the unexpected and untimely loss of Julius Turman shortly after his resignation. He was a remarkable man and an exemplary public servant.

I know it is now time for two of the mayor's commissioners to be selected. I was mortified that the un-elected four-month term mayor put forth two names rather than defer to the ELECTED mayor to do this! **It is the next Mayor that will be working with the commissioners for the next four years, or more. His is really enjoying his power, and is determined to abuse it if not stopped. This concerns me!**

I want to thank the six supervisors who rejected the re-appointments, because it was the right thing to do on the principle of it.

And with all due respect, as a concerned citizen who wants meaningful police reform, these two commissioners put forth by the un-elected mayor, haven't really stepped up as champions for the communities they represent. It always seems, no matter the testimony of the public and public safety experts, these two commissioners dismiss us, disregard us, and vote contrary to our wishes time and time again. It's as if they are obligated to serve others, other than the ordinary citizens of San Francisco.

I hope that these appointments will not be entertained until the new mayor is in office to nominate their picks.

As Supervisor Cohen will soon term out, while there is time, I want to extend extra gratitude to her for everything she has done for police accountability since Mario Woods was so killed for no reason. As a mother, this causes my profound pain every single day. Supervisor Cohen has truly stood with her constituents, and the citizens of San Francisco as a whole, with her legislation and votes. Thank you Supervisor Cohen!

As a public servant myself, I appreciate the dedication and sacrifice of our police officers, and I know that majority are good people, but there has been a very sick culture simmering among some in the SFPD for decades, and the racism running unchecked has got to stop! The fact that there was no discipline for the officers who sent racist texts about their colleague, is infuriating. I do not care if they were on company time and property or not, they have a badge and a gun, and need to be above reproach as public servants. I am certain if I were to behave that way at my job, I would be looking for a new job. This is why we need to carefully evaluate and select the next four commissioners.

I think San Francisco is slowly moving towards real police reform, but we have a long way to go.

Regards,
Tami Bryan

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 12:25 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS); Young, Victor
Subject: FW: Letter of Support for John Hamasaki (SF Police Commission)
Attachments: Marie Ma_Letter of Support for John Hamasaki.pdf

From: Marie Ma [mailto:mariejma@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 12:07 PM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Support for John Hamasaki (SF Police Commission)

Dear all,

Attached please find my letter of support for John Hamasaki for your consideration.

Best regards,

Marie Ma

mariejma@gmail.com

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 12:25 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS); Young, Victor
Subject: FW: Support Anne Irwin's appointment to the San Francisco Police Commission
Attachments: Support Anne Irwin's appointment to the San Francisco Police Commission.doc

From: Dorsey Nunn [mailto:dorsey@prisonerswithchildren.org]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support Anne Irwin's appointment to the San Francisco Police Commission

Good morning Board of Supervisor,

Please see attached support letter for Anne Irwin to the San Francisco Police Commission.

Thank you,
Dorsey Nunn, Executive Director
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
1540 Market Street, #490
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-255-7036 x312 / fax 415-552-3150
Dorsey@prisonerswithchildren.org
www.prisonerswithchildren.org





May 21st, 2018

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102
Attention: Rules Committee

Re: Police Commission Applicant Anne Irwin

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I enthusiastically and unequivocally support Anne Irwin's appointment to the San Francisco Police Commission. I have known Ms. Irwin for more than a decade. Her father, Professor John Irwin, was one of the earliest supporters of my efforts to organize and empower formerly incarcerated people and their families. Ms. Irwin has followed in her father's footsteps by working every day to make San Francisco a more just and equitable place, and to give a voice to the voiceless.

Ms. Irwin has a keen ability to bring all different sides to the table and find common ground. She has integrity and a strong backbone. She is insightful and open-minded. These qualities make her particularly equipped to be an effective, fair, and productive member of the Police Commission.

I hope you will do a service to all of San Francisco's communities and appoint Ms. Irwin to the Police Commission.

Sincerely,

Dorsey Nunn
Executive Director
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
Founder
All of Us or None

1540 Market St., Suite 490,
San Francisco, CA 94102.

Phone: (415) 255-7036
Fax: (415) 552-3150

www.prisonerswithchildren.org

BOS-11

5/30/2018

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2018 JUN -1 PM 4:07

BY AB

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
FROM: Bonnie and Robert White
326 Phelan Ave
SF. CA 94112
RE: Renaming of Phelan Ave to Frida Kahlo Way

Dear Ms. Cavillo and members of the Board of Supervisors

It is probable that we will not be able to attend the meeting on June 11th at 1:00 p.m., so we are writing this comment regarding the changing of the name of our street. We vigorously protest the name change for the following reasons:

- We were not invited to the meetings held to make the decision to change the name. That was bilaterally done by Supervisor Yee and CCSF. By the time neighbors were invited to a meeting, it was a "renaming meeting", and Phelan was not on the list. I stated at that time that I was against the name change, and my husband did as well. We were told by Supervisor Yee that, "It is a done deal". Also, a representative from CCSF was there and was strongly pushing for Frida Kahlo Way. We were able to come up with another name, and it was added to the voting ballot. Those ballots were mailed to the neighbors for voting on a name. The neighbors I spoke to all wrote in Phelan Ave, but we never heard what the outcome of the vote was. At the "renaming meeting" we were told that residents' votes would be weighted at 50%, CCSF, 40%, Riordan, 10%. When the ballots arrived, the weighting was as follows; Residents, 40%, Riordan, 10%, CCSF, 40%, and OTHERS, 10%???? We never got results. Very unfair to us!! We are residents. We pay taxes. CCSF staff and students largely live outside SF and don't vote or pay taxes, yet they are invited to vote on this.
- Frida Kahlo was a member of the Mexican Communist Party and a communist sympathizer of the Russian party. Her marriage to Diego Rivera was a volatile one in which they cheated on each other continually. One of her lovers was Leon Trotsky, a Russian revolutionary. She was an artist and a feminist, but what did she really do for San Francisco or to enhance women's rights? I can't find anything on that. We don't want our street named after a communist.
- There were 2 Phelans in SF history. The first one was an Immigrant from Ireland. He came to San Francisco and made his fortune and a good life here. He was a prominent businessman for whom I believe our street was named for. His son was the mayor in the late 1800s and he did a lot of good for the city, including fighting the corruption that was overtaking politics in the city. He was against the Japanese settling here because Japan was our enemy at the time. When we became allies, the Japanese came with little resistance.
- Changing Phelan to Frida Kahlo Way just doesn't make sense. This is hurting the people of my street, with the possible exception of City College. Please let us keep Phelan Ave.

Thank You!!!

Bonnie White Robert White

Bonnie White/Robert White

326 Phelan Ave, SF, CA 94112

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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


NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

- Date:** June 11, 2018
- Time:** 1:30 p.m.
- Location:** Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA
- Subject:** File No. 180371. Resolution renaming Phelan Avenue, between Flood Avenue and Ocean Avenue, to "Frida Kahlo Way."

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 8, 2018.


Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED/MAILED/POSTED: May 30, 2018

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 11:37 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Issue with Fire Department

From: TL SF Presidio [mailto:0043@whg.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MayorMarkFarrell (MYR) <mayormarkfarrell@sfgov.org>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>
Cc: John Bloom <johnpbloom@aol.com>
Subject: Issue with Fire Department

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Tyler Shanahan and I have been the manager of the Travelodge at the Presidio in the Marina district for the last nine and a half years. Our small business has been operating since 1956 serving the local community, military (during the active Presidio days), and international travelers ever since. In my nine and a half years as the General Manager of the hotel I have adhered to all the standards and laws placed upon us. We remit our taxes on time and correctly as well as maintain our corner of the Marina district with pride. I've learned about new policies that affect us, and been proactive in keeping our hotel a safe and fun place to work and visit.

Each year the Fire Department comes to our hotel to do their yearly inspections. They will tell us if something is wrong or needs fixing, we pass inspection, and on goes the day. Recently, this January 2018, we had an inspector tell us we needed to have a 5-year sprinkler test done. This was the first time in nine years I had been asked about this requirement. I know that simply not knowing the law is not a valid excuse and was happy that the inspector brought this to our attention. We began work immediately to keep our hotel, staff, and guest safe.

I contacted Arrow Fire to have our sprinkler certification completed. They setup a time for an estimate, and once approved, they began the test. After a few weeks of getting through this process Arrow Fire got back to me with some items that needed attention. Smaller things like the signage and extra sprinkler valves were easy to fix but a bigger issue was a leaky pipe near the main water feed. I asked Arrow Fire if they had a recommendation for a company and they suggested Aegis.

After being in contact with Aegis for a couple weeks I finally got them out here (from Pleasanton) to do a bid for us. After receiving the bid, I approved it, and we scheduled a time to complete the repairs. While they did the repairs they found a lot of buildup in the pipe and said it needed fixing. I agreed and awaited a proposal to complete the repairs. In the meantime I contacted Arrow Fire to have them fix the smaller things. After waiting a few weeks I followed up with Arrow and they were concerned that Aegis had never contacted me back. Saying Arrow would fix their items when the pipe was fixed so they could complete and certify our sprinkler system at the same time. I followed up with Aegis and they finally got me a bid to start the testing process to determine the solution to our issue.

All along this months long process I have been getting very uneasy calls from the Fire Department. First Inspector Tim Wong, then his replacement, and recently Lt. Diane Vanderheiden. They call threatening action if we did not complete the repairs. I apprise them of our efforts, where we are in the process, and explain the situation. They have all acted dismissive and as if the situation were out of their control. Lt. Vanderheiden was very aggressive in our phone call yesterday and I felt there were several times she was going to hang up on me. She seemed uncaring and unsympathetic

to our situation and made me feel I was not doing my job, incompetent, and trying to avoid the issue. I feel I have done as much as I can to keep the progress on track, I am at the whim of the companies who do the work since neither I nor my staff is certified to work on sprinkler systems.

I feel this has been a very aggressive attack on our small business to complete a large task in an unreasonable amount of time. I have been informative and communicative to the various inspectors along the way and have been met with a lack of professionalism from the Fire Department. To me it feels like they are targeting us in a new sting operation for sprinkler systems. To me it feels like the city is putting so much pressure on the Fire Department to complete this one piece of a much larger issue in order to feel more compliant with regulations that should have been inspected each year they came by.

In summary I feel the Fire Department has been attacking our hotel for months to complete a repair and I feel we should be allowed a reasonable amount of time to comply. If we are getting this kind of pressure as a small business, I cannot imagine how much pressure the larger businesses are under. If this is the case all over The City, then I imagine all the companies that perform this kind of work are being overrun with work orders causing the same delays we have encountered along the way. I would like to be informed about the new policies in place regarding this matter and how we can move forward in a positive way. I would like nothing more than for our hotel to be as safe as possible and am working towards that goal every day.

Please reach out to me via email or phone so we can discuss the matter in more detail. I would appreciate a response to know my concerns are understood.

Respectfully,

Tyler Shanahan | General Manager | 415.931.8581 | www.TravelodgePresidio.com

Located at the entrance of famous Presidio Park!

Travelodge San Francisco Presidio

• 2755 Lombard Street • San Francisco, California 94123

)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 11:35 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Hello, Rise in the number of homeless in our streets.

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

From: Jessie J [mailto:hotissue88@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 2:05 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Hello, Rise in the number of homeless in our streets.

Hello,

My name is Nancy Jiang, and I am a small business owner running a small tourist resort. Recently, there has been a notable decline in the number of tourists visiting San Francisco. Consequently, business has slowed down. We have made losses in the past three quarters. I have a staff of 12 employees, and even though we have not laid-off any of them, I am afraid if the trend persists, we will have no choice but to resize our workforce.

While there are many factors that could have contributed to the decline in the number of tourists, I believe the unprecedented increase in the number of homeless is a major contributor to the decline. A city as beautiful as ours should not have a problem attracting tourists. In fact, the city attracts nearly twenty-five million tourists each year and supports more than eighty thousand jobs. However, the rise in the number of homeless in our streets is tarnishing the reputation of San Francisco as a clean and beautiful city. The loss in reputation is contributing to the decline in the number of tourists. I ask your urgent assistance in solving this issue of rising homeless people in our streets. As a government, I believe you have the power and the resources to solve the problem. As a member of the business community, I am willing to engage with you to brainstorm alternatives that would help us to solve this challenge quickly. The future of our business and that of the families that earn a living from the business depend on the speedy resolution of this challenge.

Yours faithfully

Nancy Jiang

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 11:32 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Enforce LAW and ORDER back into SAN FRANCISCO....NOW!...STOP the GHETTO-IZING

From: chris w [mailto:dragonflysf@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 2:47 PM
To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Enforce LAW and ORDER back into SAN FRANCISCO....NOW!...STOP the GHETTO-IZING

To Whom it may CONCERN,

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS TO TAKE BACK CONTROL of the CITY,NOT ALLOW CRIMINALS and HOMELESS.....GHETTO-IZE this BEAUTIFUL CITY,to TRASH and LAWLESSNESS....ALLOWING RAMPANT FARE EVADERS on PUBLIC TRANSITS -MUNI and BART to House HOMELESS and CRIMINALS to RIDE FREE,ITS BECOME A JOKE TO "PAY" on MUNI or BART!!!!....REALLY????

WE NEED MORE STING OPERATIONS to STOP THIS LAWLESS HABITS,and STOP the FREE MIGRATION of HOMELESS to TRASH ANY NEIGHBORHOODS
THEY CAN FREELY TRAVEL TO BY NOT PAYING ON PUBLIC TRANSITS!!

WE DONT HAVE BARS AROUND THIS CITY,IF YOU CAN"T AFFORD LIVING HERE<Then you are FREE to GO OTHER PARTS of this STATE OR COUNTRY to LIVE CHEAPER and WORK FOR LIVING,NOT TAKE AND TAKE Advantage of this CITY and STATE!!

WHY IS THE RIGHTS OF THE CRIMINALS and HOMELESS..TO SLUM OUR CITY and make it UNSAFE and UNCLEAN for MAJORITY of WORKING and CONTRIBUTING Citizens to the CITY BUDGET....and YOUR PAY!!

ENFORCE THE LAWS ALREADY ON THE BOOKS,and NO MORE EXCUSES OR SO CALLED LONG TERM SOLUTIONS.....TAKE ACTIONS NOW!!

San Franisco WORKING and PAYING TAXPAYERS!!!

)

From: :) <gumby5@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 10:02 AM
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); 'Rich Hillis'; 'Rodney Fong'
Cc: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Haddadan, Kimia (CPC); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Kim, Jane (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: CSFN Letter for Case No. 2018-004194PCA (Board File No. 180268 -- Amendments to ADU Requirements
Attachments: CSFN 2018-004194PCA (Board File No. 180268 .pdf

Dear Planning Commissioners,
Please see attached CSFN Letter on subject-referenced matter for the 6/7/2018 meeting.
Thank you.
Rose H.



LOCAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Members

May 30, 2018

Matthew Ajiake
Emylene Aspilla- SFO
Bruce Giron
Juliana Choy-Sommer
Vice Co-Chair
Darolyn Davis
Alaric Degrafinried - OCA
Boris Delepine - SFPUC
Vice Co-Chair
Elahe Enssani
Miguel Galarza, Chair
Alan Guy
Virginia Harmon - SFMTA
Dwayne Jones
Iris Martin-Lopez - SFPUC
Wayne Perry
Ruben Santana

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee ("LBEAC") is composed of representatives of CMD-LBE Certified firms and City Departments. The LBEAC advises the City Administrator and the Director of the Contract Monitoring Division on implementation of and proposed amendments to the Chapter 14B Local Business Enterprise Utilization and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance.

The LBEAC has met several times to discuss the possible impacts of the proposed Citywide Project Labor Agreement ("PLA") for Public Works or Improvement Projects. On May 30, 2018, the LBEAC held a Special Meeting regarding the proposed Citywide PLA. At this meeting, the LBEAC approved the attached seven recommendations to the proposed legislation. The purpose of the LBEAC's recommendations reflect the LBEAC's intent of increasing the pool of bidders and continuing Mayor Ed Lee's legacy of providing opportunities to the City's local businesses. Moreover, the LBEAC is deeply concerned about potential impacts and possible discrimination against minority-, women-, and immigrant-, owned businesses.

Please feel free to contact me directly at mgalarza@yerba-buena.net regarding any questions or concerns you have about the LBEAC's recommendations to the proposed PLA legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Miguel Galarza".

Miguel Galarza
Committee Chair
Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee

LBE Advisory Committee's Recommendations on the Proposed Citywide Project Labor Agreement Ordinance

Item	Section	As is in Draft of Proposed Section 6.27	Committee's Recommendation:	Committee Vote:
1	Definitions 6.27(c)	<p><i>"Covered Project" means a project involving Public Work or Improvement as defined in Administrative Code Section 6.1, if either: (1) the Department Head estimates the Cost of the project to exceed the following threshold amounts: \$5,000,000 for Covered Projects where the Advertisement for Bid is released in fiscal year 2018-2019, \$3,000,000 for Covered Projects where the Advertisement for Bid is released in fiscal year 2019-2020, and \$1,000,000 thereafter, or (2) the Department Head has determined that delay in completing the project may lead to interruption or delay of services or use of facilities that are important to the essential operations or infrastructure of the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, "Covered Project" does not include any Public Work or Improvement projects undertaken by the San Francisco International Airport, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Port of San Francisco, or the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. "Covered Project" also does not include; or any Public Work or Improvement project where application of the citywide PLA would violate the conditions of a state, federal, or other public funding source.</i></p>	<p>The committee recommends that there should be no increase or decrease to the threshold amount unless there is a compelling justification for said increase/decrease that is supported by a study conducted by an independent party. The study will examine any potential discriminatory impacts as well as the effects on the Local Hire and Local Business Enterprise Programs due to the PLA. Accordingly, the items highlighted in yellow should be revisited.</p> <p>The abovementioned study should be a separate assessment from the evaluation mentioned in 6.27(f), which is fiscal in its subject focus and would not address all of the City's interests.</p>	<p>Unanimously approved by all members present.</p>

2	Definitions 6.27(c)	<p><i>"Covered Project" means a project involving Public Work or Improvement as defined in Administrative Code Section 6.1, if either: (1) the Department Head estimates the Cost of the project to exceed the following threshold amounts: \$5,000,000 for Covered Projects where the Advertisement for Bid is released in fiscal year 2018-2019, \$3,000,000 for Covered Projects where the Advertisement for Bid is released in fiscal year 2019-2020, and \$1,000,000 thereafter, or (2) the Department Head has determined that delay in completing the project may lead to interruption or delay of services or use of facilities that are important to the essential operations or infrastructure of the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, "Covered Project" does not include any Public Work or Improvement projects undertaken by the San Francisco International Airport, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Port of San Francisco, or the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. "Covered Project" also does not include; or any Public Work or Improvement project where application of the citywide PLA would violate the conditions of a state, federal, or other public funding source.</i></p>	<p>The Committee recommends that the dates referenced in the legislation be deleted because the dates as stated do not feasibly allow for implementation.</p>	<p>Unanimously approved by all members present.</p>
3	6.27 (d)		<p>The Committee recommends that the legislation include the following:</p> <p>In the interest of increasing bid competition, the Department Head/Awarding Department must rebid the project without the PLA where the submitted bids are 25% over the estimated cost of the project.</p>	<p>Unanimously approved by all members present.</p>

4			<p>The Committee recommends that any subcontractor with a subcontract valued at less than one million dollars not be bound by the PLA.</p>	<p>Unanimously approved by all members present.</p>
5	<p>Definitions 6.27(c)</p>	<p>“Core Employee” means an employee of a Contractor that has not previously had a relationship with the Unions that demonstrates the following qualifications: (1) possesses any license required by state or federal law for the Project work to be performed; (2) has worked a total of at least 1,000 hours in the construction craft during the prior three years; (3) has been on the Contractor’s active payroll for a substantial portion of the calendar year immediately prior to the contract award; and (d) has the ability to perform safely the basic functions of the applicable trade.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that there be no reference to the Contractor’s active payroll in the definition of “Core Employee” and to allow up to 75% of the contractor’s workforce to be made up of core employees.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee proposes the following definition:</p> <p>“Core Employee” means an employee of a Contractor that has not previously had a relationship with the Unions that demonstrates the following qualifications: (1) possesses any license required by state or federal law for the Project work to be performed; (2) has worked a total of at least 1,000 hours in the construction craft during the prior three years; and (3) has the ability to perform safely the basic functions of the applicable trade.</p>	<p>Unanimously approved by all members present.</p>

	6.27(e)(4)	<i>(4) Contractors and Subcontractors to whom construction services are awarded for a Covered Project will use the hiring halls operated by signatory Unions for all labor on the Covered Project except for (A) the services provided by non-craft managerial, executive, and clerical employees.; (B) and supervisory employees above the level of general foreman; or (C) at least two Core Employees per Covered Project.</i>	<p>The Committee proposes the following language for Section 6.27(e)(4):</p> <p>Contractors and Subcontractors to whom construction services are awarded for a Covered Project will use the hiring halls operated by signatory Unions for all labor on the Covered Project except for (A) the services provided by non-craft managerial, executive, and clerical employees.; (B) and supervisory employees above the level of general foreman; or (C) the services provided by Core Employees where 75% or less of the Project workforce is made up of Core Employees.</p>	
6	6.27(e)(5)	<i>(5) Contractors and Subcontractors will hire apprentices indentured in the State-approved joint apprenticeship program for the applicable craft or trade for work on the Covered Project in accordance with the apprentice ratios contained in California Labor Code Section 1777.5, as it may be amended from time to time;</i>	<p>In order to increase opportunities, the Committee recommends removing the limiting language and proposes the following:</p> <p>(5) Contractors and Subcontractors will hire apprentices indentured in any State-approved apprenticeship program for the applicable craft or trade for work on the Covered Project in accordance with the apprentice ratios contained in California Labor Code Section 1777.5, as it may be amended from time to time;</p>	Unanimously approved by all members present.

7	6.27(e)(2)	(2) Unions, Contractors, and Subcontractors are bound by the requirements of Administrative Code Chapters 6, 14B, 82, and 83, as they may be amended from time to time, including but not limited to the provisions addressing Local Hire and Local Business Enterprise;	<p>Chapter 12B of the San Francisco Administrative Code is not mentioned in the draft. The Committee recommends that Chapter 12B be included in the list of Administrative Code Chapters:</p> <p>(2) Unions, Contractors, and Subcontractors are bound by the requirements of Administrative Code Chapters 6, 12B, 14B, 82, and 83, as they may be amended from time to time, including but not limited to the provisions addressing Local Hire and Local Business Enterprise;</p>	Unanimously approved by all members present.
---	------------	--	---	--

360 BUCKINGHAM, WAY #103
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94132

23 May 2018

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
City Hall, Suite 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett
San Francisco, CA 94102

S.F. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
City Hall, Room 244
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor:

Dear Supervisors:

From the sound of fury on the issuance and implementation of Deadly Force Devices, specifically that of TASERS, it is abundantly apparent to me that no one in San Francisco's Officialdom, is cognizant from a historical standpoint in the case of two Law Enforcement Agencies, each in a different nation whose Agents or Officers at one time period had no self-defense/preservation weapon on their person:

UNITED STATES


FBI Agents (formerly referred to as G-Men)

UNITED KINGDOM

British Police Officers (referred to as "Bobbies")

I do not necessarily recall when the FBI Agents commenced with issuance of weapons and concealment as a self-defense measure, nor when or if ever the Bobbies were granted similar self-arming. However, I do know as the old saying goes, "When Guns are Outlawed, Outlaws Got and Get the Guns". It is now time long overdue that the San Francisco Police Department's Law Enforcement Staff Members warrant Acquisition, Possession, and Use of Tasers FORTHWITH. Let Not San Francisco Officialdom be FAKES, FLAKES, AND WIMPIES/WUSSIES ON THIS LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE! Tasers HAVE BEEN TESTED AND PROVEN LESS OR NOT LETHAL AS HAVE BULLETS.

Sincerely,



Martin T. Lyon

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 MAY 29 AM 8:50
JY

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 9:43 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: File No. 180387- Ordinance Amendment Designating 224-246 First Street a Landmark.

From: Marvis Phillips [mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 02, 2018 2:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Curtis Bradford <curtisbradford5@gmail.com>; Denise Dorey <axisofloveposse@gmail.com>; Dennis Isner <disnersf@yahoo.com>; Otto Duffy <ottoduffy@gmail.com>; Regi Meadows <meadowsregi@gmail.com>; Susan Bryan <sueroseus@gmail.com>
Subject: File No. 180387- Ordinance Amendment Designating 224-246 First Street a Landmark.

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please forward these remarks to all Board Members, thank you.

The "Phillips Building" at 234-246 1st. Street, is named have my family, one of my grand uncles owned a fairly substantial amount of property here in San Francisco around the start of the 20th Century, and his family still owns a fair amount of that original property, so I am extremely proud to be able to SUPPORT this property to be declared a "Landmark" under Article 10 of the Planning Code. And thank you for taking up this matter.

Sincerely,

Marvis J. Phillips
Tenderloin Activist for 40 years.

--

Marvis J. Phillips
Board Chair
District 6 Community Planners

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 8:03 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: IRC Statement on Separation of Children from Parents at the Border
Attachments: IRC Statement on Family Separation_060118.pdf

From: Pon, Adrienne (ADM)
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2018 5:30 PM
To: Engagement, Civic (ADM) <civic.engagement@sfgov.org>
Subject: IRC Statement on Separation of Children from Parents at the Border


Dear Colleagues,


Please see the attached statement by the Immigrant Rights Commission on the administration's policy of separating children from their parents at the border.

Always,

Adrienne

A D R I E N N E P O N
Executive Director | **OFFICE OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS**
City & County of San Francisco
50 Van Ness Avenue | San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: 415.581.2358 (ask for Melissa Chan, Executive Coordinator/Office Manager)
| 415.581.2317 (direct) | Website: [OCEIA](#) | [Immigrant Rights Commission](#)

Connect with OCEIA:   





CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 2018

IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION CONDEMNS THE SEPARATION OF CHILDREN FROM THEIR PARENTS

On this National Day of Action for Children, we call on the American government to do right by children and end the shameful practice of breaking up innocent immigrant families.

In recent weeks, the U.S. government has systematically separated immigrant parents from their children and babies as they arrive at the border, many seeking refuge. Since the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Department of Justice (DOJ) announced a “zero tolerance” policy for unauthorized border migration, parents arriving at the border have automatically been placed in criminal proceedings and separated from their children without being told where their children are or when they will be reunited. Children, some as young as a year old, have been reportedly housed away from their parents and siblings on military bases. This policy and practice changes the definition of who qualifies as an unaccompanied minor and criminalizes anyone who enters or reenters the border without authorization, even those planning to apply for asylum.

According to DHS reports, over 600 children were separated from their parents during just two weeks in May. Separating families is not only cruel and inhumane, it goes against our deepest values as Americans **and crosses the line of decency**. These parents are doing what any good parent would do. They are fleeing some of the most dangerous countries in the world to save their families, only to have their babies and children taken from them.

The administration’s decision to punish parents by taking their children away is only the latest in a series of anti-immigrant policies being carried out to break up families and demonize immigrants. We have already seen working mothers and fathers who have lived in the U.S. for decades be detained and deported. Hundreds of thousands of legal Temporary Protected Status (TPS) recipients will soon lose their status. They will be forced to decide whether to leave their American children behind to be raised by others, or take them with them to countries where their lives may be in danger.

As Americans, we value the contributions of immigrants who come here to make a better life for their families. Our country has long been a refuge to those fleeing persecution and violence. When our government treats newcomers and asylum seekers as criminals, and separates them from their children, we lose sight of who we are as a nation. Children belong with their families.

The San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission calls for our local, state and national leaders to fight this policy, stand up for immigrant families that help make America strong, and stop the terrorizing of immigrant children and parents.

BOS-11



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

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102



**VICKI L. HENNESSY
SHERIFF**

May 31, 2018
Reference: 2018-060

The Honorable Mark Farrell
Mayor
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Chapter 96A 2018, First Quarter Report

Dear Mayor Farrell,

I am submitting my department's first-quarter report required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A.

Code Chapter 96A.1 of the Administrative Code defines the Sheriff Department's use of force as "use of force on an individual that results in a known injury." California Penal Code §834 defines arrests as the, "taking of a person into custody, in a case and manner authorized by law."

By these definitions, my department is reporting 38 uses of force and 157 arrests this quarter.

If you have any questions, please contact my Executive Assistant, Ted Toet, at 415-554-7225 or by email at theodore.toet@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Vicki L. Hennessy
Sheriff

Cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Sergeant Rachael Kilshaw, San Francisco Police Commission
Sheryl Davis, Human Rights Commission

218



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102



VICKI L. HENNESSY
SHERIFF

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Chapter 96A First Quarter Report – January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018

Executive Summary:

San Francisco Sheriff's deputies dedicate themselves to ensuring public safety as well as the safe, secure and humane treatment of prisoners in our custody. As required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A, this report contains statistics for arrests, encounters and uses of force.

During the third quarter of 2017, the department initiated:

Arrests:	157
Encounters:	31
Uses of Force:	38

The Sheriff's Department includes four divisions: Administration and Programs; Custody Operations; Field Operations; and Planning and Special Projects. Deputies in each division may conduct arrests, encounters or use force as necessary to protect public safety.

Division Responsibilities:

Administration and Programs

The Administration and Programs Division ensures compliance of individuals sentenced to treatment programs, electronic monitoring and the Sheriff's Work Alternatives Program (SWAP). Deputies may remand individuals into custody who violate the terms of their sentences or treatment programs. Occasionally, they encounter members of the public who pose a threat to public safety and respond as necessary.

Custody Operations

The Custody Operations Division secures the county jails and ensures inmate safety. This includes breaking up inmate fights. When inmates do not respond to verbal commands during an altercation, a deputy may deploy pepper spray to de-escalate the conflict, gain prisoner compliance and decrease the risk of injury to prisoner and deputy. If pepper spray proves ineffective, deputies may use reasonable additional force.

Department policy requires immediate medical treatment for the affected individual if a deputy uses pepper spray. Jail Health Services treats inmates in custody. Deputies seek outside medical assistance when using pepper spray in the field.

Deputies in Custody Operations carry additional responsibilities including: escorting prisoners to court appearances; facilitating prisoner participation in restorative justice and rehabilitation in-custody programs; taking individuals into custody who turn themselves in for an outstanding arrest warrant or transferred to the San Francisco Sheriff's custody from another county, and rebooking inmates who commit crimes while in jail.

Field Operations

The Field Operations Division is responsible for securing public buildings including City Hall, Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, and the Department of Public Health-Community Clinics. Deputies conduct foot patrols of these sites and may encounter individuals who pose a risk to public safety causing deputies to engage the individual. Below are reasons a deputy may contact a member of the public:

- **Consensual encounter** – *a stop and encounter with an individual who is free to disengage from the interaction at any time.*
- **Facility security checkpoint violation** – *an individual's failure to comply with, or attempt to enter a facility secured by sheriff's deputies without going through the security checkpoint, or for trying to bring in contraband.*
- **Mental health evaluation** – *an evaluation of a person who, through their behavior exhibit severe mental health symptoms or actions that constitutes terms of 5150 W&I.*

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

- **Outstanding arrest warrant** – *the identification and arrest of a person who has an unbooked warrant.*
- **Private person's arrest** – *a citizen's arrest affidavit.*
- **Probable cause** – *Information of events that legally constitute probable cause for an arrest, search or seizure.*
- **Probation or parole violation** – *a person, wanted for violating the terms of their probation or parole.*
- **Reasonable suspicion** – *information and observable facts indicating a crime has occurred.*
- **Released in error** – *human error or misreading of a court document, resulting in the release of the wrong individual from custody.*
- **Remanded into custody** – *occurs during a court appearance upon the order of a judge, or for violating the rules of a treatment program while on sentenced release.*
- **Traffic violation** – *an on-view observation of a traffic violation.*

Planning and Special Projects

The Sheriff Department's Planning and Special Projects division focuses on meeting the current and future needs of the Sheriff's Department. Members of this division have less contact with members of the public and inmates. However, they do respond to critical incidents when necessary to protect public safety.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Department-Wide Encounters:

Deputy Sheriff encounters 96A.3(a)(1)	
Administration and Programs Division	0
Custody Operations Division	0
Field Operations Division	31
Off duty encounters	0
Department totals	31

See page 12 for a complete breakdown of encounters by race, age, and gender.

Deputy Sheriff encounters resulting in a detention 96A.3(a)(1) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Administration and Programs Division	0
Custody Operations Division	0
Field Operations Division	9
Off duty encounters	0
Department totals	9

See page 13 for a complete breakdown of encounters resulting in a detention by race, age, and gender.

Deputy Sheriff encounters resulting in a traffic stop 96A.3(a)(1) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Administration and Programs Division	0
Custody Operations Division	0
Field Operations Division	4
Off duty encounters	0
Department totals	4

See page 14 for a complete breakdown of encounters resulting in a traffic stop by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Basis for initiating an encounter 96A.3(d)	
Consensual encounter	0
Facility security checkpoint violation	1
Mental health evaluation	0
Outstanding arrest warrant	0
Probable cause	23
Probation or parole violation	1
reasonable suspicion	5
Traffic violation	1
Department totals	31

See page 15 for a complete breakdown of the basis for initiating an encounter by race, age, and gender.

Basis for initiating a detention 96A.3(d)	
Consensual encounter	0
Facility security checkpoint violation	1
Mental health evaluation	0
Outstanding arrest warrant	0
Probable cause	5
Probation or parole violation	1
Reasonable suspicion	2
Traffic violation	0
Department totals	9

See page 16 for a complete breakdown of the basis for initiating a detention by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Basis for initiating a traffic stop 96A.3(d)	
Consensual encounter	0
Facility security checkpoint violation	0
Mental health evaluation	0
Outstanding arrest warrant	0
Probable cause	3
Probation or parole violation	0
Reasonable suspicion	0
Traffic violation	1
Department totals	4

See page 17 for a complete breakdown of the basis for initiating a traffic stop by race, age, and gender.

Total searches conducted by Deputy Sheriffs during encounters 96A.3(a)(3)	
Administration and Programs Division	0
Custody Operations Division	0
Field Operations Division	23
Off duty encounters	0
Department totals	23

See page 18 for a complete breakdown of searches conducted during an encounter by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Type of Searches Conducted by Deputy Sheriffs During an Encounter 96A.3(a)(4) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Arrest	0
Consent	0
Cursory, Pat, Weapons	22
Exigent circumstances	0
Plain view seizure	0
Probation/Parole	0
Strip	0
Vehicle search	1
No search	0
Department total	23

See page 19 for a complete breakdown of searches conducted during a detention by race, age, and gender.

Type of Searches Conducted by Deputy Sheriffs During a Detention 96A.3(a)(4) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Arrest	0
Consent	0
Cursory, Pat, Weapons	8
Exigent circumstances	0
Probation/Parole	0
Strip	0
Vehicle search	1
No search	0
Department total	9

See page 20 for a complete breakdown of searches conducted during a detention by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Type of Searches Conducted by Deputy Sheriffs During a Traffic Stop 96A.3(a)(4) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Arrest	0
Consent	0
Cursory, Pat, Weapons	0
Exigent circumstances	0
Probation/Parole	0
Strip	0
Vehicle search	0
No search	0
Department total	0

See page 21 for a complete breakdown of searches conducted during a traffic stop by race, age, and gender.

Total dispositions resulting from Deputy Sheriff encounters 96A.3(a)(6)	
Certificate of Release	9
Arrests	10
Citations	10
Detentions	0
Handled	1
Rehoused	1
Psychiatric emergency services	0
Department totals	31

See page 22 for a complete breakdown of dispositions resulting from an encounter by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Dispositions of Deputy Sheriff initiated detentions 96A.3(a)(6) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Certificate of Release	6
Arrests	0
Citations	3
Detentions	0
Medical Calls	0
Report made	0
Psychiatric Emergency Services	0
Department totals	9

See page 23 for a complete breakdown of dispositions resulting from a detention by race, age, and gender.

Dispositions of Deputy Sheriff initiated traffic stops 96A.3(a)(6) & 96A.3(a)(7)	
Certificate of Release	0
Arrests	0
Citations	4
Detentions	0
Medical Calls	0
Report made	0
Psychiatric Emergency Services	0
Department totals	4

See page 24 for a complete breakdown of dispositions resulting from a traffic stop by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Department-Wide Use of Force:

Deputy Sheriff Uses of Force 96A.3(b)(1)	
Administration and Programs	0
Custody Operations Division	33
Field Operations Division	5
Off Duty use of Force	0
Department total	38

The 33 instances of pepper spray below are extracted from the Custody Operations Division's total uses of force and are part of the division's total 38 uses of force.

Uses of pepper spray	
Uses of Pepper Spray only	30
Uses of pepper spray and additional force	1
Department total	31

During the third quarter of 2017, a deputy's use of force did not result in death.

See page 25 for a complete breakdown of uses of force by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

Department-Wide Arrests:

Deputy Sheriff arrests 96A.3(c)(1)	
Administration and Programs Division	8
Custody Operations Division	34
Field Operations Division	115
Department totals	157

See page 26 for a complete breakdown of arrests by race, age, and gender.

Basis for initiating arrests 96A.3(d)	
Consensual encounter	0
Crime by prisoner	3
Mental health evaluation	0
Outstanding arrest warrant	123
Private persons arrest	5
Probable cause	22
Probation or parole violation	0
Reasonable suspicion	0
Release in error	0
Remand into custody	4
Facility security checkpoint violation	0
Traffic violation	0
Department totals	157

See page 27 for a complete breakdown of the basis for initiation an arrest by race, age, and gender.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(2) & 96A.3(a)(7)
 Total Department Encounters
 Resulting in a Detention
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	9	Total	0	Total	0	Total	9	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Black	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	White	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	4	44%	0	-	0	-	4	44%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	1	11%	0	-	0	-	1	11%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	50+	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	7	78%	0	-	0	-	7	78%	0	-	0	-
	Female	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(2) & 96A.3(a)(7)
 Total Department Encounters
 Resulting in a Detention
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	9	Total	0	Total	0	Total	9	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Black	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	White	3	33%	0	-	0	-	3	33%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	4	44%	0	-	0	-	4	44%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	1	11%	0	-	0	-	1	11%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	50+	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	7	78%	0	-	0	-	7	78%	0	-	0	-
	Female	2	22%	0	-	0	-	2	22%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(2) & 96A.3(a)(7)
 Total Department Encounters
 Resulting in a Traffic Stop
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	4	Total	0	Total	0	Total	4	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Black	2	50%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	2	50%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	White	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	3	75%	0	-	0	-	3	75%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	50+	1	25%	0	-	0	-	1	25%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	0	0%	0	-	0	-	4	100%	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(d)
Basis for Initiating an Encounter
By Race, Age, and Gender
January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

	Department total		Consensual encounter		Facility security checkpoint violation		Mental health evaluation		Outstanding arrest warrant		Probable cause		Probation/Parole violation		Reasonable suspicion		Traffic violation		
	Total	31	Total	0	Total	1	Total	0	Total	0	Total	23	Total	1	Total	5	Total	1	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Black	13	42%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	9	39%	1	100%	3	60%	0	0%
	Hispanic	5	16%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	3	13%	0	0%	1	20%	1	100%
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	White	12	39%	0	-	1	100%	0	-	0	-	10	43%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	18 - 29	11	35%	0	-	1	100%	0	-	0	-	8	35%	0	0%	1	20%	1	100%
	30 - 39	7	23%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	6	26%	0	0%	1	20%	2	200%
	40 - 49	4	13%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	3	13%	1	100%	0	0%	4	400%
	50+	8	26%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	5	22%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%
	Unknown	1	3%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	Male	22	71%	0	-	1	100%	0	-	0	-	14	61%	1	100%	5	100%	1	100%
	Female	9	29%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	9	39%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(d)

Basis for Initiating a Detention

By Race, Age, and Gender

January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Consensual encounter		Facility security checkpoint violation		Outstanding Arrest Warrant		Probable cause		Reasonable suspicion		Probation or Parole Violation	
		Total	9	Total	0	Total	1	Total	0	Total	5	Total	2	Total	1
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Black	3	33%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	1	20%	1	50%	1	100%
	Hispanic	3	33%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	2	40%	1	50%	0	0%
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	White	3	33%	0	-	1	100%	0	#DIV/0!	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	18 - 29	4	44%	0	-	1	100%	0	#DIV/0!	2	40%	1	50%	0	0%
	30 - 39	1	11%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	40 - 49	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%
	50+	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	1	20%	1	50%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	Male	7	78%	0	-	1	100%	0	#DIV/0!	3	60%	2	100%	1	100%
	Female	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(d)
Basis for Initiating a Traffic Stop
By Race, Age, and Gender
January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Consensual encounter		Facility security checkpoint		Outstanding arrest warrant		Probable cause		Probation/parole violation		Reasonable suspicion		Traffic violation	
		Total	4	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	3	Total	0	Total	0	Total	1
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Black	2	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	67%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Hispanic	2	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	33%	0	-	0	-	1	100%
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	White	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	18 - 29	3	75%	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	1%	0	-	0	-	1	100%
	30 - 39	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	40 - 49	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	50+	1	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	33%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
Gender	Male	4	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	0%	0	-	0	-	1	100%
	Female	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(3)

Total Searches Conducted During Deputy Sheriff Encounters
By Race, Age, and Gender
January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	23	Total	0	Total	0	Total	23	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	4%	0	-	0	-	1	4%	0	-	0	-
	Black	10	43%	0	-	0	-	10	43%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	13%	0	-	0	-	3	13%	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	White	9	39%	0	-	0	-	9	39%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	8	35%	0	-	0	-	8	35%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	5	22%	0	-	0	-	5	22%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	3	13%	0	-	0	-	3	13%	0	-	0	-
	50+	7	30%	0	-	0	-	7	30%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	16	70%	0	-	0	-	16	70%	0	-	0	-
	Female	7	30%	0	-	0	-	7	30%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(5) & 96A.3(a)(7)
Types of Searches Conducted During an Encounter
By Race, Age, and Gender
January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

	Department total		Arrest		Vehicle		Cursory, Pat, Weapons		Exigent circumstances		Plain view seizure		Probation/Parole violation		Warr/Cursory Arrest Search		Warrant/Cursory		Warrant		
	Total	23	Total	0	Total	1	Total	22	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	4%	0	-	0	0%	1	5%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Black	10	43%	0	-	0	0%	10	45%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	13%	0	-	1	100%	2	9%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	White	9	39%	0	-	0	0%	9	41%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	8	35%	0	-	1	100%	7	32%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	5	22%	0	-	0	0%	5	23%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	3	13%	0	-	0	0%	3	14%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	50+	7	30%	0	-	0	0%	7	32%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	
Gender	Male	16	70%	0	-	1	100%	15	68%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	7	30%	0	-	0	0%	7	32%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(5) & 96A.3(a)(7)

Types of Searches Conducted During a Detention

By Race, Age, and Gender

January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

	Department total		Arrest		Vehicle		Cursory, Pat, Weapons		Edgent circumstances		Plain view seizure		Probation/Parole violation		Strip		Warrant/Cursory		Warrant		
	Total Number	9 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	1 Percentage	Total Number	8 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Black	3	33%	0	-	0	0%	3	38%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	33%	0	-	1	100%	2	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	White	3	33%	0	-	0	0%	3	38%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	4	44%	0	-	1	100%	3	38%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	1	11%	0	-	0	0%	1	13%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	2	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	50+	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	2	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	7	78%	0	-	1	100%	6	75%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	2	22%	0	-	0	0%	2	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(5) & 96A.3(a)(7)
Types of Searches Conducted During a Traffic Stop
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Arrest		Consent		Cursory, Pat, Weapons		Edgent circumstances		Plain view seizure		Probation/Parole violation		Strip		Vehicle		Warrant	
		Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Black	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	White	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Age	>18	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	50+	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(6)
 Total Dispositions Resulting from Encounters
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Advised		Arrests		Certificate of Release		Citations		Detentions		Handled		Rehoused		Report made	
		Total	31	Total	0	Total	10	Total	9	Total	10	Total	0	Total	1	Total	1	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	Black	13	42%	0	-	6	60%	2	22%	4	40%	0	-	0	0%	1	100%	0	-
	Hispanic	5	16%	0	-	0	0%	3	33%	2	20%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	White	12	39%	0	-	4	40%	4	44%	3	30%	0	-	1	100%	0	0%	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	18 - 29	11	35%	0	-	3	30%	3	33%	5	50%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	30 - 39	7	23%	0	-	4	40%	1	11%	0	0%	0	-	1	100%	1	100%	0	-
	40 - 49	4	13%	0	-	0	0%	1	11%	3	30%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	50+	8	26%	0	-	3	30%	3	33%	2	20%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	Unknown	1	3%	0	-	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
Gender	Male	22	71%	0	-	5	50%	6	67%	9	90%	0	-	1	100%	1	100%	0	-
	Female	9	29%	0	-	5	50%	3	33%	1	10%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(6) & 96A.(a)(7)
 Total Dispositions Resulting from Detentions
 By Race, Age, and Gender
 January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

	Department total		Admonished		Abated		Arrests		Certificate of Release		Citations		Medical call		Psychiatric Emergency Services		Report made		
	Total	9	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	6	Total	3	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Black	3	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	33%	1	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	3	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	50%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	White	3	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	17%	2	67%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
Age	>18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	4	44%	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	50%	1	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	1	11%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	17%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	2	22%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	2	67%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	50+	2	22%	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	33%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	7	78%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	2	67%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	2	22%	0	-	0	-	0	-	5	83%	1	33%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	1	11%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	17%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(a)(6) & 96A.(a)(7)

Total Dispositions Resulting from Traffic Stops

By Race, Age, and Gender

January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Abated		Arrests		Citations		Detentions		Medical call		Psychiatric Emergency Services		Report made	
		Total	4	Total	0	Total	0	Total	4	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Black	2	50%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	2	50%	0	-	0	-	2	50%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	White	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Age	>18	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	3	75%	0	-	0	-	3	75%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	50+	1	25%	0	-	0	-	1	25%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	4	100%	0	-	0	-	4	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	0%	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(b)(3)

Uses of Force

By Race, Age, and Gender

January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	38	Total	0	Total	33	Total	5	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Black	17	45%	0	-	17	52%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	9	24%	0	-	8	24%	1	20%	0	-	0	-
	Other	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	White	10	26%	0	-	6	18%	4	80%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	2	5%	0	-	2	6%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	20	53%	0	-	19	58%	1	20%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	14	37%	0	-	14	42%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	2	5%	0	-	0	0%	2	40%	0	-	0	-
	50+	2	5%	0	-	0	0%	2	40%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	34	89%	0	-	30	91%	4	80%	0	-	0	-
	Female	4	11%	0	-	3	9%	1	20%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	-	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
 Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(c)(2)

Arrests

By Race, Age, and Gender

January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

		Department total		Administration and Programs Division		Custody Operations Division		Field Operations Division		Planning and Special Projects		Off-duty deputies	
		Total	157	Total	8	Total	34	Total	116	Total	0	Total	0
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	9	6%	1	13%	4	12%	5	4%	0	-	0	-
	Black	68	43%	3	38%	15	44%	50	43%	0	-	0	-
	Hispanic	32	20%	3	38%	7	21%	22	19%	0	-	0	-
	Other	1	1%	0	0%	1	3%	1	1%	0	-	0	-
	White	41	26%	1	13%	7	21%	33	28%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	6	4%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4%	0	-	0	-
Age	<18	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	18 - 29	46	29%	3	38%	9	26%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	30 - 39	38	24%	2	25%	8	24%	34	29%	0	-	0	-
	40 - 49	43	27%	2	25%	12	35%	28	24%	0	-	0	-
	50+	30	19%	1	13%	5	15%	30	26%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	24	15%	0	0%	0	0%	24	21%	0	-	0	-
Gender	Male	123	78%	6	75%	27	79%	91	78%	0	-	0	-
	Female	33	21%	2	25%	7	21%	24	21%	0	-	0	-
	Transgender	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-
	Unknown	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-	0	-

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Use of Force Report – First Quarter of 2018

96A.3(d)
Basis for Initiating an Arrests
By Race, Age, and Gender
January 1, 2018 - March 31, 2018

	Department total		Consensual encounter		Crime by prisoner		Facility security checkpoint violation		Outstanding arrest warrant		Private persons arrest		Probable cause		Probation/parole violation		Release in error		Remanded into custody	
	Total Number	157 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	3 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	123 Percentage	Total Number	5 Percentage	Total Number	22 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	0 Percentage	Total Number	4 Percentage
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	9 6%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	8 7%	1 20%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	Black	68 43%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	48 39%	3 60%	13 59%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 100%	0 0%
	Hispanic	32 20%	0 -	2 67%	0 -	0 -	0 -	26 21%	1 20%	3 14%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	Other	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	White	41 26%	0 -	1 33%	0 -	0 -	0 -	34 28%	0 0%	6 27%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	Unknown	6 4%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	6 5%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
Age	<18	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	18 - 29	46 29%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	34 28%	2 40%	8 36%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 25%	0 0%
	30 - 39	38 24%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	31 25%	0 0%	5 23%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 50%	0 0%
	40 - 49	43 27%	0 -	2 67%	0 -	0 -	0 -	34 28%	2 40%	4 18%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 25%	0 0%
	50+	30 19%	0 -	1 33%	0 -	0 -	0 -	23 19%	1 20%	5 23%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
	Unknown	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%
Gender	Male	123 78%	0 -	3 100%	0 -	0 -	0 -	99 80%	5 100%	14 64%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 50%	0 0%
	Female	33 21%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	24 20%	0 0%	8 36%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 25%	0 0%
	Transgender	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 25%	0 0%
	Unknown	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0%	0 0%

The department rounded percentages to the nearest whole number.