

FILE NO: 181157

Petitions and Communications received from November 19, 2018, through November 26, 2018, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on December 4, 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 Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 5.9, submitting State Legislation Committee approved bill positions from the November 14, 2018 meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Recreation and Park Department, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 6.60(b), submitting notice of a declaration of emergency due to failure of the domestic hot water system at The Beach Chalet. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Public Works, regarding the Third Street sewer system emergency repair. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From California Fish and Game, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relative to California Code of Regulations, Section 29.06, Title 14, regarding the Purple Sea Urchin on the Northern California coast and filleting of fish on vessels (California Sheephead). 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Theresa Rettinghouse, of Lozeau Drury, LLP, regarding a CEQA and Land Use Notice Request for the Balboa Reservoir. Copy Each Supervisor. (5)

From Pacific Gas & Electric, regarding notice of request to offer new rates for commercial electric vehicle charging. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From Henry Karnilowicz, regarding refuse separation compliance. File No. 180646. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Frances Taylor, regarding e-scooters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Roan Kattouw, regarding off street parking requirements. File No. 181028. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding SFSU-CSU master-planning. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding Spare the Air Day. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2018 NOV 16 PM 1:48

BY Ak

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Edward McCaffrey, Manager of State and Federal Affairs
RE: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions – November 14th, 2018 Meeting
DATE: November 16, 2018

Dear Madam Clerk:

Please be advised that at the November 14, 2018 meeting, the State Legislation Committee approved policy priorities for the following departments.

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

- Commercial Real Estate & Housing Development
- Workforce Development
- Business/Economic Development

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Transportation Funding
- Vision Zero
- Emerging Mobility and Innovation
- Parking Policy
- Land Use and Housing
- Shared Policy Priorities of City Departments

San Francisco International Airport

- SFO Emissions Reduction
- Mandatory Airport Environmental Regulations
- Transportation Network Company Regulations
- Shoreline Protection Program
- High-Speed Rail

Present at the meeting were representatives from the Mayor's Office, the Office of President Cohen, the City Attorney's Office, Supervisor Stefani's Office, and the Treasurer's Office. In addition, please find attached the approved minutes from the August 8, 2018 meeting of the State Legislation Committee.

Sincerely,

Eddie McCaffrey
Manager of State and Federal Affairs
Office of Mayor London N. Breed



**STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES
Wednesday, August 8, 2018
11:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 201**

MEMBERS:

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Edward McCaffrey
San Francisco Board of Supervisors -- Malia Cohen
Supervisor Stefani -- Jack Gallagher
City Attorney's Office -- Mary Jane Winslow
Treasurer's Office -- Jacob Dumez
Assessor's Office -- Nicole Agbayani
Controller's Office -- Michelle Allersma

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Edward McCaffrey, Malia Cohen, Jack Gallagher, Mary Jane Winslow, Jacob Dumez, Michelle Allersma
Absent: Assessor's Office - Vacant

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting of June 14, 2018.

No public comment.
Motion to approve: Mary Jane Winslow
Seconded by: Jacob Dumez
Approved: 6-0

III. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee with review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

District Attorney's Office

Presenter(s): Tara Anderson

- a. AB 931 (Weber)
Recommended Position: Support

The purpose of this bill is to revise the standard for use of deadly force by peace officers.

Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter(s): Kate Breen, Jadie Wasilco

a. AB 1698 (Daly)

Recommended Position: Support

This bill makes driving while operating a wireless communications device punishable by a violation point.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Michelle Allersma

Seconded by: Jacob Dumez

Approved: 6-0

b. SB 1132 (Hill)

Recommended Position: Oppose

This bill creates a separate violation for failing to yield at a red light for the purpose of making a right- or left-hand turn from a one-way street to another.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Michelle Allersma

Seconded by: Jacob Dumez

Approved: 6-0

Department of Adult Probation

Presenter(s): Geoffrea Morris

a. AB 2138 (Chiu)

Recommended Position: Support

This bill limits the current discretion provided to regulatory entities within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to apply criminal history background, as it relates licensure.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Malia Cohen

Seconded by: Michelle Allersma

Approved: 6-0

b. SB 1025 (Skinner)

Recommended Position: Support

This bill authorizes the court to grant probation for specified drug offenses which are currently either ineligible or presumptively ineligible for probation.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Jacob Dumez

Seconded by: Malia Cohen

Approved: 6-0

c. SB 1393 (Mitchell)

Recommended Position: Support

This bill allows a judge the discretion to strike a prior serious felony conviction to avoid the imposition of the five-year prison enhancement when the defendant has been convicted of a serious felony.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Jacob Dumez

Seconded by: Michelle Allersma

Approved: 6-0

d. SB 906 (Beall)

Recommended Position: Support

This bill establishes the Peer Support Specialist Certification Program Act of 2018.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Mary Jane Winslow

Seconded by: Malia Cohen

Approved: 6-0

IV. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

No public comment.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance,

contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

Document Review

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eddie McCaffrey at (415) 554-6588 or Edward.McCaffrey@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.



POS-11
3016 DEP

London N. Breed, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

November 9, 2018

Mayor London N. Breed
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Rm. 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Rm. 244, Attention: Ms. Angela Calvillo
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Ben Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, Rm. 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Subject: Beach Chalet Water Heating System Project
Emergency Contract - Declaration of Emergency**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 NOV 26 AM 9:34
BY _____ AK

Dear Mayor Lee, Members of the Board and Mr. Rosenfield:

Pursuant to Section 6.60(b) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, you are hereby notified that in my capacity as the appropriate Department Head, I have declared an emergency at the The Beach Chalet. The declaration was made due to the failure of the domestic hot water heating system. In order to provide heat and hot water to the restaurant operation, The Beach Chalet, immediate replacement of the water heating system was required. The cost of the repalcement was \$64,465.00.

Sincerely,

Philip Ginsburg
General Manager, Recreation and Park Department

805-11



November 5, 2018

Mayor London Breed
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Rm. 200

London N. Breed
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

Bruce Robertson
Finance Manager

General Administration/Finance
1155 Market St., 4th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
tel 415-554-5418

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

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Rm. 244
Attention: Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Mr. Ben Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Rm. 316

Subject: Third Street Sewer System Emergency Repair

Dear Mayor Breed, Members of the Board and Mr. Rosenfield:

An Emergency exists as a result of an inspection and discovery of a damaged storm sewer system in the vicinity of Third Street between Berry Street and the Third Street Bridge. The damage includes some settlement of the basin, cracks within the walls and lid of the sewer and some void spaces. The current state of the sewer system poses a hazard to the sewer system function and the safety of the roadway and public above. There is an imminent risk of collapse of the roadway and sidewalk on a highly travelled portion of the street. Such collapse could harm pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, or workers and City personnel at the adjacent construction site. This condition constitutes an emergency involving the health, safety and property of the citizens of the City & County of San Francisco.

San Francisco Public Works' internal order is attached for your reference, which explain the necessity for immediate action. Public Works has retained the services of Substructure Support, Inc. to immediately begin the work. The cost for the work is currently anticipated to be less than \$700,000.00.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mohammed Nuru", written over a horizontal line.

Mohammed Nuru
Director of Public Works

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 NOV -6 PM 3:48
BY [initials]

City and County of San Francisco



**London N. Breed, Mayor
Mohammed Nuru, Director**

San Francisco Public Works

GENERAL - DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

City Hall, Room 348
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102
(415) 554-6920 ■ www.SFPublicWorks.org



Public Works Order No: 200136

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS
EMERGENCY DECLARED AND CONTRACT AWARDED**

An **Emergency** exists as a result of an inspection and discovery of a damaged storm sewer system in the vicinity of Third Street between Berry Street and the Third Street Bridge. The damage includes some settlement of the basin, cracks within the walls and lid of the sewer and some void spaces. The current state of the sewer system poses a hazard to the sewer system function and the safety of the roadway and public above. There is an imminent risk of collapse of the roadway and sidewalk on a highly travelled portion of the street. Such collapse could harm pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, or workers and City personnel at the adjacent construction site. This condition constitutes an emergency involving the health, safety and property of the citizens of the City & County of San Francisco.

Therefore, in order to move forward with the project before the start of the winter season, **an Emergency is declared to exist** under the provisions of Section 6.60 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and

**Substructure Support, Inc.
4989 A Peabody Road
Fairfield, Ca. 94533**

is hereby awarded a contract to provide the necessary repair work for the affected sewer system at a cost not to exceed **\$700,000.00**.

Contractor shall indemnify and hold harmless the City & County of San Francisco, its officers, agents and employees and furnish certificates of insurance protecting Contractor, any sub-contractors and the City & County of San Francisco and its officers, agents and employees against claims arising out of work performed pursuant to this order with the City & County of San Francisco, its officers, agents and employees named as additional insureds.

Commercial General Liability Insurance with limits not less than \$1,000,000 each occurrence, and \$2,000,000 general aggregate, combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage, including coverage for contractual liability, independent contractors, explosion, collapse and underground (XCU), personal injury, broadform property damage and completed operations.

Commercial Automobile Liability Insurance with limits not less than \$1,000,000 each occurrence combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage, including owned, hired or non-owned vehicles, as applicable.

Workers' Compensation, in statutory amount, including Employers' Liability coverage with limits not less than \$1,000,000 each accident, injury or illness.

Contractor is notified that in the event that Contractor employs professional engineering or land surveyor services for performing field engineering or preparing design calculations, plans and specifications, Contractor shall require the retained



San Francisco Public Works
Making San Francisco a beautiful, livable, vibrant, and sustainable city.

engineers and land surveyors to carry professional liability insurance with limits not less than \$1,000,000 each claim with respect to negligent acts, errors or omissions in connection with professional services to be provided under the subject Contract.

This Order serves as the Notice to Proceed.

DISTRIBUTION:

Substructure Support, Inc.

IDC: Patrick Rivera@sfdpw.org; Iqbal.Dhapa@sfdpw.org, Ray.Lui@sfdpw.org, Thomas.Roitman@sfdpw.org

Deputy Director: John.Thomas@sfdpw.org

Public Affairs: Jennifer.Blot@sfdpw.org

K2Systems: K2Systems@sfdpw.org

Contract Admin: ContractAdmin.Staff@sfdpw.org;

X

DocuSigned by:

Thomas, John

Thomas,35E21A1422EC48E...

Acting Director of Public Works

X

DocuSigned by:

Dawson, Julia

Dawson, Ju...90C3DBA632E341F...

Mayor's Designee

BOS-11

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
 Saint Helena
Anthony C. Williams, Vice President
 Huntington Beach
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
 McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
 Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
 Jamul

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
 Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
 P.O. Box 944209
 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
 (916) 653-4899
 fgc@fgc.ca.gov
 www.fgc.ca.gov

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2018 NOV 26 AM 9:34
 BY AK

November 16, 2018

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 29.06, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to take provisions of Purple Sea Urchin on the northern California coast, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on November 23, 2018.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments. Additional information and associated documents may be found on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2018/index.aspx>.

Anthony Shiao, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Ms. Haggerty can be reached by telephone at (805) 560-6056 or by email at Anthony.Shiao@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

David Thesell
 Program Manager

Attachement

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Section 200, 205, 260, 265 and 399 of the Fish and Game Code (FGC) and to implement, interpret or make specific Section 200, 205, 260, 265 and 399 of said Code, proposes to add Section 29.06, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to increase of recreational take of purple sea urchin.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The addition of Section 29.06 increases the recreational take of purple sea urchin to 40 gallons. This is one of several actions taken by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) that is necessary to protect the historic and valuable ocean habitat on the northern California coast. The recent increase in population of the purple sea urchin has led to significant losses of ocean habitat. Unchecked, the purple sea urchin has decimated kelp beds leading to the decline of abalone and other important marine life dependent on this unique ecosystem.

As an emergency rule, Section 29.11 increased recreational take of purple sea urchin to 20 gallons. This provision is due to sunset on February 7, 2019. To maintain recreational interest in purple sea urchins, to the end that will benefit kelp and abalone recovery, a standard rulemaking is necessary to allow a higher take limit.

Furthermore, bull kelp, the dominant kelp in northern California, is an annual species. Any restoration attempt would yield observable results only after it has been conducted for a year or more. As such, both the goal of supporting a growing recreational interest and the goal of restoring habitat require the new regulation 29.06 for at least the next two or more years.

The addition of Section 29.06 extends the higher take limit to Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, and possibly Del Norte counties.

Benefits of the Regulations

The regulation would maintain a developing recreational interest in purple sea urchin as well as help reduce grazing pressure in a vulnerable ecosystem.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulations are consistent with Section 29.05, Title 14, CCR. Commission staff has searched the CCR and found no other regulations that address the recreational take of purple sea urchin and therefore finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations. The Legislature has delegated authority to the Commission to adopt regulations necessary to regulate the recreational take of fish, including purple sea urchins (FGC Section 205). No other state agency has the authority to regulate the recreational take of purple sea urchin.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the QLN Conference Center, 1938 Avenida del Oro, Oceanside, California, on Wednesday, December 12 at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in Sacramento, California, on February 7, 2019 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. The specific location for this meeting is still being determined. As soon as this information is available, but not less than thirty days before the hearing, a continuation notice will be sent to interested and affected parties providing the exact location. The continuation notice will also be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register and published on the Commission's website.

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before January 23, 2019 at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on January 31, 2019. All comments must be received no later than February 7, 2019, at the hearing in Sacramento, California. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or David Thesell at the preceding address or phone number. Anthony Shiao, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, phone (805) 560-6056 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

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

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

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

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

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. Option 1: New Take Limit for Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma Counties, and Option 2: New Take Limit for Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma Counties would both create permanent incentives for more tourists to travel to coastal northern California and help stimulate local economy.

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

The Commission does not anticipate any impact on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California because the proposed regulation is not likely to substantially increase or decrease recreational fishing opportunities within California. The proposed regulation, (both Option 1 and Option 2) is expected to increase interests in recreational diving in northern California that previously did not exist, which may provide a small increase in economic stimulus to local economies.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents (from both Option 1 and Option 2) through the vigorous activity required to pursue purple sea urchin. The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to worker safety because the proposed regulation will not affect existing working conditions. The Commission anticipates some benefit (from both Option 1 and Option 2) to the state's environment through the restoration of kelp forest habitats to foster and support a diverse balance of species.

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

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action (for both Option 1 and Option 2).

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.
- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

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

(h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

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

Consideration of Alternatives

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

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: November 13, 2018

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director

PDS-11

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Anthony C. Williams, Vice President
Huntington Beach
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Jamul

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov
www.fgc.ca.gov

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 NOV 26 AM 9:39
BY 4K

November 16, 2018

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to subsection (b) of Section 27.65, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to filleting of fish on vessels (California sheephead), published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on November 16, 2018

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments. Additional information and associated documents may be found on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2018/index.aspx>.

Miranda Haggerty, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Ms. Haggerty can be reached by telephone at (562) 342-7162 or by email at Miranda.Haggerty@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 205, 265, 313, 5508 and 5509 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 200, 205, 265, 313, 399, 5508 and 5509 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 27.65, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to filleting of California sheephead on vessels.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Section 27.65, Title 14, CCR, defines fillet; lists the fillet requirements for, and specifies those fish that may be filleted on a boat or brought ashore as fillets; and prohibits the filleting, steaking, or chunking of any species with a size limit unless a fillet size is otherwise specified. Section 28.26, Title 14, CCR, specifies the bag limit, size limit, open areas, seasons and depth constraints for the recreational take of California sheephead (*Semicossyphus pulcher*).

The proposed regulatory change to subsection 27.65(b), Title 14, CCR, adds a 6.75-inch minimum fillet length, and requires that the entire skin remain intact, allowing legal-sized California sheephead to be filleted on board vessels while at sea and brought ashore as fillets.

In addition, authority and reference citations are proposed to be amended in accordance with recent organizational changes to Fish and Game Code.

Benefits of the Proposed Regulation: The proposed regulation is in response to the Sportfishing Association of California and the recreational angling community that have been requesting a fillet length regulation for California sheephead since 2001. As such, the regulation may increase angler satisfaction. Additionally, the proposed regulation may benefit the health and welfare of California residents through the increased consumption of nutritious California sheephead, and may benefit the environment through the return of California sheephead carcasses to the sea to be recycled back to the marine ecosystem.

Consistency with Existing State Regulations: The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Section 20, Article IV, of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate the recreational take of fish. The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The proposed regulation is consistent with existing state regulations as almost all finfishes with a recreational minimum size limit also have a corresponding fillet length. The Commission has searched the CCR and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to the recreational take of California sheephead or to the filleting of fish on board vessels at sea.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the QLN Conference Center, 1938 Avenida del Oro, Oceanside, California, on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in Sacramento, California, on Thursday, February 7, 2019, at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. The exact location of this meeting has not yet been determined. As soon as this information is available but not less than thirty days before the hearing, a continuation notice will be sent to interested and affected parties providing the exact location. The continuation notice will also be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register and published on the Commission's website. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before January 23, 2019, at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before 12:00 noon on January 31, 2019. All comments must be received

no later than February 7, 2019, at the hearing in Sacramento, California. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or Sherrie Fonbuena at the preceding address or phone number.

Miranda Haggerty, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (562) 342-7162 or Miranda.Haggerty@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

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

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

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

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

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states, because the proposed regulation will not increase net compliance costs or impact fishing effort and recreational fishing expenditures for recreational fishing related businesses. While not significant or statewide, commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) businesses may choose to spend an estimated \$60 - \$110 per year on more plastic bags for the additional fillets and for the maintenance of fillet knives. This equates to \$12,660 - \$23,210 in costs for all CPFVs statewide. This will not affect the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states because these small individual expenditures would increase customer satisfaction and be offset by fillet fee revenue.

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

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California because the proposed regulation is not likely to increase or decrease recreational fishing opportunities within California. It is possible that the implementation of the proposed regulation may increase workload for deckhands aboard CPFVs as the number of fish that can be filleted in an angler's catch at the end of the day will increase. However, it is unlikely that the demand will increase so much that additional jobs will be necessary.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents through the consumption of more California sheephead, a nutritious food.

The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to worker safety.

The Commission anticipates some benefit to the state's environment through the return of California sheephead carcasses to the marine ecosystem after being filleted.

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

This regulatory action will allow for the option for individuals to choose to pay \$2 - \$3 per fillet, which may amount to as much as \$10 - \$15 per CPFV trip. Individual CPFV businesses may choose to spend an estimated \$60 - \$110 per year on more plastic bags for the additional fillets and for the maintenance of fillet knives.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.
- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

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

Consideration of Alternatives

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

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director

Dated: November 6, 2018

1305-11

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2018 NOV 19 PM 3:11

BY Ak



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

410 12th Street, Suite 250
Oakland, Ca 94607

www.lozeaudrury.com
michael@lozeaudrury.com

Via Email and U.S. Mail

November 14, 2018

Jeanie Poling
San Francisco Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission St, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

Thomas Shanahan
Office of Economic and Workforce Development,
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA
94102-4653
BRCAC@sfgov.org

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

John Rahaim, Director
San Francisco Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
John.Rahaim@sfgov.org

Jonas P. Ionin
Secretary of Planning Commission
San Francisco Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco 1650
Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

County Clerk
Office of the County Clerk
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 168
San Francisco, CA 94102-4678

**Re: CEQA and Land Use Notice Request for the Balboa Reservoir aka
SCH2018102028 and 2018-007883ENV**

Dear Ms. Poling, Mr. Shanahan, Mr. Rahaim, Ms. Calvillo, Mr. Ionin, and County Clerk:

I am writing on behalf of the Laborers International Union of North America, Local Union 261 and its members living in the City and County of San Francisco ("LiUNA"), regarding the Balboa Reservoir Project aka SCH2018102028 and 2018-007883ENV, including all actions related or referring to the construction of approx. 1.8 M gsf of uses, including between approx. 1.3 and 1.5 M gsf of residential space (1,100 to 1,550 dwelling units plus residential amenities), approx. 10,000 gsf of community space (childcare and a community room for public use), approx. 7,500 gsf of retail, up to 550 residential parking spaces and 750 public parking spaces in the Developer's Proposed Option

November 14, 2018

CEQA and Land Use Notice Request for the Balboa Reservoir Project aka SCH2018102028 and 2018-007883ENV

Page 2 of 3

and up to 650 residential parking spaces in the Additional Housing Option located at the cross of Ocean Ave and Lee Ave, Parcel No: Assessor's block 3180/lot 190 ("Project").

We hereby request that the City and County of San Francisco send by electronic mail, if possible or U.S. Mail to our firm at the address below notice of any and all actions or hearings related to activities undertaken, authorized, approved, permitted, licensed, or certified by the City and County of San Francisco and any of its subdivisions, and/or supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans or other forms of assistance from the City and County of San Francisco, including, but not limited to the following:

- Notice of any public hearing in connection with the Project as required by California Planning and Zoning Law pursuant to Government Code Section 65091.
- Any and all notices prepared for the Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), including, but not limited to:
 - Notices of any public hearing held pursuant to CEQA.
 - Notices of determination that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is required for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.4.
 - Notices of any scoping meeting held pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.9.
 - Notices of preparation of an EIR or a negative declaration for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.
 - Notices of availability of an EIR or a negative declaration for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 and Section 15087 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.
 - Notices of approval and/or determination to carry out a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 or any other provision of law.
 - Notices of approval or certification of any EIR or negative declaration, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 or any other provision of law.
 - Notices of determination that a project is exempt from CEQA, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21152 or any other provision of law.
 - Notice of any Final EIR prepared pursuant to CEQA.
 - Notice of determination, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21108 or Section 21152.

Please note that we are requesting notices of CEQA actions and notices of any public hearings to be held under any provision of Title 7 of the California Government Code governing California Planning and Zoning Law. **This request is filed pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21092.2 and 21167(f), and Government Code Section 65092**, which requires agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the clerk of the agency's governing body.

In addition, we request that the City and County of San Francisco send to us via email or U.S. Mail a copy of all Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator and Board of Supervisor meeting and/or hearing agendas.

Please send notice by electronic mail, if possible or U.S. Mail to:

November 14, 2018

CEQA and Land Use Notice Request for the Balboa Reservoir Project aka SCH2018102028 and
2018-007883ENV

Page 3 of 3

Theresa Rettinghouse

Lozeau Drury LLP

410 12th Street, Suite 250

Oakland, CA 94607

510 836-4200

Michael@lozeaudrury.com

theresa@lozeaudrury.com

hannah@lozeaudrury.com

Please call if you have any questions. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Theresa Rettinghouse".

Theresa Rettinghouse

Paralegal

Lozeau | Drury LLP

November 15, 2018

TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

**NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S REQUEST TO OFFER NEW RATES FOR
COMMERCIAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING (A.18-11-003)**

805-11
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2018 NOV 26 AM 9:33

SUMMARY

On November 5, 2018, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed a proposal with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to offer new rate options for charging commercial electric vehicles. This application does not represent an increase in rates. This application is requesting to create a new Commercial Electric Vehicle Charging customer class along with two rate options (CEV-small and CEV-large) specifically for commercial electric vehicle charging stations.

BACKGROUND

PG&E's application will help California meet the goals outlined in Senate Bill 350: Clean Energy & Pollution Reduction Act (SB 350). The goals of SB 350 are to reduce dependence on petroleum, meet air quality standards and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In support of these goals, PG&E's application will help promote the adoption of electric vehicles across the state. In addition, the proposed rate options offer customers access to lower prices for fueling electric vehicles compared to fossil fuels.

HOW WILL PG&E'S APPLICATION AFFECT ME?

At this time, PG&E does not expect this application to impact existing customer rates. PG&E business customers who install electric vehicle charging stations will be able to take advantage of new rate plans with lower costs to charge their vehicles during off-peak hours.

HOW WILL PG&E'S APPLICATION AFFECT CUSTOMERS WHO BUY ELECTRICITY FROM A THIRD PARTY?

At this time, PG&E does not expect this application to impact existing customer rates. Direct Access and Community Choice Aggregation customers receive generation services from a third party provider and customers should contact their provider to learn about the rate options available to them.

Departing Load customers do not receive electric generation, transmission or distribution services from PG&E. However, they are required to pay certain charges as required by law or CPUC decision. These customers will not be impacted by this application.

HOW DO I FIND OUT MORE ABOUT PG&E'S PROPOSALS?

If you have questions about PG&E's filing, please contact PG&E at 1-800-743-5000. For TTY (speech-hearing impaired), call 1-800-652-4712. Para más detalles llame al 1-800-660-6789 • 詳情請致電 1-800-893-9555. If you would like a copy of PG&E's filing and exhibits, please write to PG&E at the address below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Electric Vehicle Commercial Rate Application (A.18-11-003)
P.O. Box 7442
San Francisco, CA 94120

A copy of PG&E's filing and exhibits is also available for review at the CPUC's Central Files office by appointment only. For more information, contact aljcentralfilesid@cpuc.ca.gov or 1-415-703-2045. PG&E's application (without exhibits) is available on the CPUC's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

CPUC PROCESS

This application will be assigned to an Administrative Law Judge (Judge) who will determine how to receive evidence and other related documents necessary for the CPUC to establish a record upon which to base its decision. Evidentiary hearings may be held where parties will present their testimony and may be subject to cross-examination by other parties. These evidentiary hearings are open to the public, but only those who are formal parties in the case can participate.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearings, the assigned Judge will issue a proposed decision which may adopt PG&E's proposal, modify it or deny it. Any of the five CPUC Commissioners may sponsor an alternate decision. The proposed decision, and any alternate decisions, will be discussed and voted upon at a scheduled CPUC Voting Meeting.

The California Public Advocates Office (CalPA) may review this application. CalPA is the independent consumer advocate within the CPUC with a legislative mandate to represent investor-owned utility customers to obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. CalPA has a multidisciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting and engineering. For more information about CalPA, please call 1-415-703-1584, email PublicAdvocatesOffice@cpuc.ca.gov or visit CalPA's website at www.publicadvocates.cpuc.ca.gov.

STAY INFORMED

If you would like to follow this proceeding, or any other issue before the CPUC, you may use the CPUC's free subscription service. Sign up at: <http://subscribe.puc.ca.gov/>. If you would like to learn how you can participate in the proceeding, have informal comments about the application or have questions about the CPUC processes, you may access the CPUC's Public Advisor Office (PAO) webpage at www.cpuc.ca.gov/pao/.

You may also contact the PAO as follows:

Email: public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

Mail: CPUC
Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 1-866-849-8390 (toll-free) or 1-415-703-2074

TTY: 1-866-836-7825 (toll-free) or 1-415-703-5282

If you are contacting the CPUC, please include the application number (Electric Vehicle Commercial Rate Application; A.18-11-003). All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Judge and appropriate CPUC staff and will become public record.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Environment Code - Refuse Separation Compliance!- 180646
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 9:47:00 AM
Attachments: [bfc111518_agenda.pdf](#)
[Refuse Digest v4.pdf](#)
[Refuse Leg v4.pdf](#)

From: HENRY KARNILOWICZ <occexp@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR) <kanishka.cheng@sfgov.org>; Peacock, Rebecca (MYR) <rebecca.peacock@sfgov.org>; Raphael, Deborah (ENV) <deborah.raaphael@sfgov.org>
Subject: Environment Code - Refuse Separation Compliance!- 180646

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am concerned with the legislation as written as it will place a burden on businesses with the requiring of the hiring of a full time person to separate the refuse.

And the imposition of penalties as stated is too severe as there should be at least warnings. Frequently street people tip over the containers over which businesses have no control.

Take note that there has been no date provided and compliance is still tied to refuse marketability.

In the event of a failed audit the legislation requires hiring of a zero waste facilitator.

The DOE intends to impose a penalty of \$1,000 per day and a 12 month period before an audit can be requested which is extreme and unfair.

I do not support this ordinance and would very much appreciate your consideration in amending it.

Henry Karnilowicz
President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

2443 Fillmore Street #189
San Francisco, CA 94115
415.621.7533 office
415.621.7583 fax
415.420.8113 cell

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Safai Refuse Separation Ordinance (File No. 180646)
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:15:00 PM

From: Charley Goss <charley@sfaa.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 2:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: janan@sfaa.org
Subject: Safai Refuse Separation Ordinance (File No. 180646)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed and members of the Board of Supervisors,

The SF Apartment Association has reached out to many of you to express its concerns related to Supervisor Safai's Refuse Separation ordinance (File No. 180646). The ordinance aims to improve composting and recycling in large refuse-generating buildings in order to help the City achieve its waste reduction goals. The SFAA shares these conservation goals and would like to help its members achieve fully compliant composting, recycling and refuse separation in multi-family apartment buildings citywide.

Along with other members of the business community, the SFAA has met with the ordinance's sponsor, the Department of Environment, stakeholders and several members of the Board of Supervisors over the past four months in the hopes of amending the ordinance to design a refuse separation policy that is achievable, implementable, sustainable and workable for the apartment buildings, hotels, small businesses, city-owned-properties, office towers and hospitals it impacts.

The ordinance has not been amended to address any of the concerns from any of the diversity of industries and properties it would apply to.

The SFAA remains opposed to the ordinance unless the following issues are addressed:

- The ordinance ties refuse separation compliance to "the ability to process and market the materials," rather than setting forth a clearly defined refuse separation target, IE 95% of refuse separated accurately. This "moves the goalpost" for compliance standards on buildings undergoing audit and attempting to comply with refuse separation targets.

The ordinance mandates that a large refuse generator hire or designate staff who must have the “exclusive function” of serving as a zero waste facilitator for a period of two years. Requiring a new position which exclusively facilitates zero waste represents an administrative and cost burden and does not adequately recognize or allow for the limited scope in which some buildings may need zero waste facilitators on a part time or limited basis in order to become compliant. And the ordinance mandates this new hire for a two year period even if the large refuse generator passes its audit and comes into compliance. Lastly, it clearly is out of touch with the reality and difficulty of hiring for part-time or limited scope work in an increasingly unaffordable region. SFAA believes that large refuse generators should have the option of hiring or designating staff to separate waste as needed *in addition to* the employee’s other roles or responsibilities, and that the employment should not be mandated by the city to last for a period of two years.

- The ordinance authorizes Department of Environment to assess fines of \$1,000/day for failing an audit even when a large refuse generator attempts in good faith to separate waste.
- Fourth, and SFAA’s main objection to the proposed ordinance is that it does not acknowledge building residents’ role in separating their waste, recycling and compostable goods. Instead, the ordinance targets the person whose name is on the garbage bill instead of the persons or people who are contaminating the waste stream. The city has been clear that in order to achieve its waste reduction goals, it will have to incentivize a behavioral shift amongst citizens towards composting and recycling separation. However, the ordinance attempts to compel a behavior shift without holding the actual users—a building’s residents—responsible. SFAA believes the only way to drive a city-wide shift towards waste separation is if residents have “skin in the game,” or an incentive to separate their waste. Authorizing a passthrough to building occupants for noncompliant waste separation would make the ordinance more impactful in meeting the City’s waste reduction goals.

Thank you for considering the above changes to the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Charley Goss
Government and Community Affairs Manager
San Francisco Apartment Association
415.255.2288 ext. 14

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: how report e-scooters ridden on sidewalks?
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:03:00 PM

From: Frances Taylor <duck.taylor@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 10:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; mtaboard@sfmta.org
Cc: Pi Ra <srira@sdaction.org>; Cathy DeLuca <cathy@walksf.org>; Jodie Medeiros <jodie@walksf.org>; Maybaum, Erica (BOS) <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>
Subject: how report e-scooters ridden on sidewalks?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This morning (Sunday), I saw a Scoot e-scooter being ridden on the sidewalk on NB San Jose Avenue, turning east onto 29th Street at about 9:50. I called the number that's printed, in very small type on the handlebars, for Scoot "questions and comments" and tried to leave a message of complaint. Scoot has no voicemail for such complaints, only for scooters parked illegally. I left a message anyway but have no hopes that this rider, who could be identified by GPS records, will ever get reprimanded or banned. I then called 311 and found the same response. No capacity for reporting e-scooters in motion, just parked. (The 311 operator was as helpful as she could be, given the limitations.)

How are we supposed to complain about scooters being ridden on the sidewalk? This seems more dangerous than illegal parking, but evidently no one cares about pedestrians being hit by scooters in motion. How can this be?

The public should have a widely publicized hotline number for all e-scooter complaints. I found the "questions and comments" numbers for Scoot and Skip after a long search of parked scooters, and now I learn that those numbers won't even work for moving violations.

I hope to hear of some solution soon.
Fran Taylor
duck.taylor@yahoo.com

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: In support of eliminating minimum parking requirements (file number 181028)
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 1:44:00 PM

From: Roan Kattouw <roan.kattouw@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 8:01 PM
To: Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>
Subject: In support of eliminating minimum parking requirements (file number 181028)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to you in support of file number 181028 ("eliminate minimum off-street parking requirements City-wide") by Supervisor Kim. Eliminating minimum parking requirements will help take cars off our streets and encourage more people to use sustainable modes of transportation. Reducing parking has been shown to reduce driving. This is crucial for combating climate change, improving air quality, and making our streets safer. Right now most of our state is either on fire or choking on smoke, demonstrating the need for swift action to reduce emissions. Eliminating parking minimums is not nearly a dramatic enough step, but if the Board can't even pass this, I have little hope that it can take more impactful steps to reduce driving and promote sustainable transportation to an extent that will make a dent in our transportation emissions.

Minimum parking requirements also waste land that could be used for housing instead; more housing was already direly needed, but as the recent fires destroy more homes, the housing shortage will only worsen. Housing people should be prioritized over housing cars, so I urge you to vote in favor of this ordinance.

Roan Kattouw
District 6 resident

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: SFSU-CSU 2035 Masterplanning Comments - A.Goodman
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:04:29 PM
Attachments: [2018_11_18_SFSUMASTERPLAN2035_commentAGoodman.pdf](#)

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 3:08 PM
To: brandonkline@sfsu.edu
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFSU-CSU 2035 Masterplanning Comments - A.Goodman

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Brandon Kline Assoc. Director Environmental Programs

Please find my attached memo regarding the SFSU-CSU Masterplan.

I have attended prior EIR hearings regarding earlier SFSU-CSU Masterplanning efforts and submitted comments and concerns. Other neighborhood organizations and tenants groups have been consistently concerned with the loss of rent controlled housing on the westside of SF. The ongoing impacts of SFSU have not been adequately determined with documentation on the gentrification of Parkmerced by SFSU-CSU and its growth defining impacts on rental housing stock on the westside of SF.

I am strongly opposed to further growth mechanisms of the U.Corp and their planners. I hope this memo finds enough volume to echo other's sentiments on the SFSU-CSU Masterplanning impacts, talking to Jason Porth while amicable does not solve these impacts. Like a wolf in sheeps clothing the pirating of essential rental housing stock in D7 has occurred for too long, and the transit and traffic impacts of SFSU require a more fundamental change in how planning occurs citywide to enforce decent and adequate options and alternatives that focus on SF Planning goals and longer term efforts to solve transit and housing impacts of institutional growth such as SFSU-CSU.

Thank you for including this memo email with the memo attached as part of the SFSU-CSU record submitted to the Trustees and Planners on this project.

It behooves you as an "environmental" director of programs to go watch the online video "Who Killed Parkmerced?" and realize that the impacts on housing go far deeper than just the Parkmerced planners, it was a dual-headed behemoth including SFSU-CSU that killed Parkmerced. The city may never recover the loss at this rate.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Spare the Air Day? - How about restrict the vehicles day regardless of urgency?
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:09:00 PM

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 1:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Spare the Air Day? - How about restrict the vehicles day regardless of urgency?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

The concern is that we have seen the positive

- a) suggestion to get masks to the homeless, and spaces off the street due to the health concerns.
- b) seen Muni step up with free muni today and on the dates impacted.

but there is the negative of not addressing "heat-inversions" and the impacts of driving on days like this. The traffic on the mission corridor and out on the freeways was .as usual terrible. And everywhere lyft/uber and gas vehicles ignoring their impacts and worsening of the conditions....

Why is there not legislation that restricts vehicles on the roads of SF when air gets this bad?

Should there be a law?

Maybe restricting auto personal useage on such dates, and fines people driving vs. taking public transit and e-vehicles?

Seems we could improve the air greatly without the current traffic jams every morning on days where the air is highly unbreathable and the vehicles are causing heat inversions to occur over the city....

Lets plan for the future and implement some serious enviornmentally sound strategies on air-quality.

We all breathe the air right?

https://hoodline.com/2018/11/schools-cancelled-muni-rides-free-as-sf-grapples-with-worst-air-quality-worldwide?fbclid=IwAR2eGe9NWDL82GXBVqE1m75aOV_Ll6dlSxPhtkvGtaQAseIcGG27zK2Yu24

A.Goodman D11