



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council Members

FROM: Dennis Hawkins, CMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
June 3 - 9, 2011

DATE: June 10, 2011

ITEMS TRANSMITTED TO THE ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

- (a) Letter from Gilbert Wong, Mayor of Cupertino, to Mayor Reed and City Council dated May 16, 2011 regarding City of San Jose future pension obligations.
- (b) Notification letter from Pacific Gas and Electric to Mayor Reed and Council dated June 3, 2011 regarding 2012 Electric Procurement Forecast Costs and Other Project Costs Applications
- (c) Letter from David Wall to Mayor Reed and Council dated June 9, 2011 regarding "San Jose – the Murder Capital of Silicon Valley."
- (d) Letter from Cathy Trujillo, Volunteer for Habitat Conservation Now and City Employee, to Mayor Reed and City Council dated June 10, 2011 expressing support for the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan.

Dennis Hawkins, CMC
City Clerk

DH/tld

<p>Distribution:</p>	<p>Mayor/Council City Manager Assistant City Manager Assistant to City Manager Council Liaison Director of Planning</p>	<p>Director of Transportation Public Information Officer San José Mercury News Library Director of Public Works Director of Finance</p>	<p>City Attorney City Auditor</p>
----------------------	---	---	---------------------------------------



CUPERTINO

OFFICE OF MAYOR GILBERT WONG

CITY HALL
10300 TORRE AVENUE • CUPERTINO, CA 95014-3255
TELEPHONE: (408) 777-3191 • FAX: (408) 777-3366
gwong@cupertino.org



May 16, 2011

The Honorable Mayor Chuck Reed
The Honorable Vice Mayor Madison Nguyen
The Honorable Peter Constant
The Honorable Ash Kalra
The Honorable Sam Liccardo
The Honorable Kansen Chu
The Honorable Xavier Campos
The Honorable Pierluigi Oliverio
The Honorable Rose Herrera
The Honorable Donald Rocha
The Honorable Nancy Pyle

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor and members of the San Jose City Council:

The steps you are considering to reduce the future pension obligations of the City of San Jose are a rash and ill-advised approach to solving what is recognized as a real financial problem. I urge you not to proceed with a Declaration of Fiscal and Public Safety Emergency and to resolve issues of public employee compensation and benefits in the proper venue, which is at the bargaining table, not the ballot box.

Emergency declarations carry enormous consequences even if, like this one, they confer little legal authority. This declaration risks creating financial uncertainty that would endanger San Jose's bond rating, discourage business investment and lower property values while conferring no authority to resolve the underlying issues, which are the purported reason for its issuance.

The Charter amendment proposed to address the City's pension obligations is not the rational and reasoned solution that it is designed to mimic but is really a mean-spirited and vindictive attack on the employees that protect and serve the residents of San Jose. There is no other adequate description for an amendment would effectively force employees into a retirement plan inadequate by any contemporary standard and deny them raises for decades.

As Mayor of a fellow Silicon Valley city, we need to work collaboratively to address our mutual interests. Please reconsider this approach.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Wong

NOTIFICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
2012 ELECTRIC PROCUREMENT FORECAST COSTS
AND OTHER PROJECT COSTS APPLICATION

June 3, 2011
PUBLIC RECORDS COUNTY
AND CITY OFFICIALS

PUBLIC RECORD - 10

On June 1st, 2011, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed an application with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to request an increase in electricity rates of \$205 million, or an average of approximately 1.6 percent, effective January 1, 2012. This increase is due primarily to rising energy prices as compared with the current costs reflected in PG&E rates.

Each year, PG&E is required to file an application that forecasts how much it will spend the following year to ensure an adequate supply of electricity for its customers. The CPUC carefully reviews PG&E's forecast to ensure that customers are not charged more for electricity than it costs PG&E to provide. The forecasted costs are updated in late 2011 and when approved by the CPUC are included in PG&E's electric rates the following year. During that year, PG&E's actual costs and revenues are tracked, and any difference is allocated to PG&E's customers at a later date.

This application requests that the CPUC adopt PG&E's 2012 electric procurement forecast of approximately \$4.5 billion for the Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) and Generation Non Bypassable Forecast costs. PG&E recovers its electric procurement costs dollar for dollar, with no profit margin.

Will rates increase as a result of this application?

Yes, because of rising energy costs, rates will increase for most customers, although impacts for individual customers will vary. Bundled customers, or those who receive electric generation as well as transmission and distribution service from PG&E, will see rate increases. Most direct access customers, or those customers who purchase their energy from a non-utility supplier, will see rate decreases.

If the CPUC approves this application, a typical bundled residential customer using 550 kilowatt-hours (kWh) per month will see his or her average monthly bill change from \$79.70 to \$80.61, an increase of \$0.91 per month. A residential customer using 850 kWh per month, which is about twice the baseline allowance, will see his or her average monthly bill change from \$178.64 to \$183.97, an increase of \$5.33 per month. Individual customers' bills may differ.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

To request a copy of the application and exhibits or for more details, call PG&E at 1-800-PGE-5000.

For TDD/TTY (speech-hearing impaired), call 1-800-652-4712.

Para mas detalles llame at 1-800-660-6789

詳情請致電 1-800-893-9555

You may request a copy of the application and exhibits by writing to:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2012 ERRA and 2012 Generation Non Bypassable Forecast Proceeding
P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

The CPUC Process

The CPUC's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) and the Energy Division will review this application. The DRA is an independent arm of the CPUC, created by the Legislature to represent the interests of all utility customers throughout the state and obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. The DRA has a multi-disciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting and engineering. The DRA's views do not necessarily reflect those of the CPUC. Other parties of record may also participate.

The CPUC may hold evidentiary hearings where parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). These hearings are open to the public, but only those who are parties of record may present evidence or cross-examine witnesses during evidentiary hearings. Members of the public may attend, but not participate in, these hearings.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearing process, the ALJ will issue a draft decision. When the CPUC acts on this application, it may adopt all or part of PG&E's request, amend or modify it, or deny the application. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's application.

If you would like to learn how you can participate in this proceeding or if you have comments or questions, you may contact the CPUC's Public Advisor as follows:

Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue
Room 2103
San Francisco, CA 94102
1-415-703-2074 or 1-866-849-8390 (toll free)
TTY 1-415-703-5282, TTY 1-866-836-7825 (toll free)
E-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

If you are writing a letter to the Public Advisor's Office, please include the name of the application to which you are referring. All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division staff.

A copy of PG&E's 2012 ERRA and 2012 Generation Non Bypassable Forecast Proceeding and exhibits are also available for review at the California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-noon, and on the CPUC's website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/pucl>.

David S. Wall

PUBLIC RECORD C

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2011 JUN -9 P 4:38

June 9, 2011

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: **“San José - The MURDER Capital of Silicon Valley”.**

Mayor Reed’s Senior Policy Advisor positions v. Police Officer Positions

Mayor Reed’s Senior Policy Advisor positions v. Fire Fighter positions

Layoffs at the San José Police and Fire Departments will cost more lives!

Is “nepotism” going to be the “official cause of death” to murdered citizens?

Mayor Reed should be eliminating all six (6) of the Senior Policy Advisor positions and shift that funding to Police and Fire.

But, with great sadness and without a modicum of remorse, this nugatory Mayor decides to elevate the husband of one of his “Senior Policy Advisors” to the position of RDA Chief.

It’s good to be King! It’s even better to be the husband of a Senior Policy Advisor of the King! Is nepotism thriving in San José?

Meanwhile, dead bodies, murdered dead bodies are piling up at the County morgue. Families of the murdered wail at wakes and funerals as the corpses of their loved ones are lowered into their solitary, cold and desolate graves. There is “no sanctuary amid this slaughterhouse”*.

The County’s Medical Examiner shakes his head and murmurs, San José needs more cops. Then he starts yet another “Y” cut on another murder victim’s corpse as autopsy process begins, even though the bullet wound to the forehead that tore off half of the murdered victim’s skull tells the saga of fewer San José Police Officers. Yet, Mayor Reed, immune from the stench of death, callus to the cries of the murdered, pauses to promote the husband of one of his Senior Policy Advisors to Redevelopment Agency Chief. But, the carnage, the bloodletting remains unchecked.

San José’s murder rate is skyrocketing and soon with fewer Fire Fighters, they will be burning to death. Death stalks the taxpayer. But, Mayor Reed’s Senior Policy Advisors feast and enjoy unbridled merriment as the safety to the public is tossed into the toilet.

Does San José City Council’s commitment to public safety resemble the contents of a fourth world latrine? No, “death by nepotism” makes it far, far worse.

Cc: City Attorney / City Auditor / Manager / * Thanks :(John Woolfolk)... *Respectfully submitted,*

David S. Wall
06.09.11

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

Dear San Jose City Mayor & Council,

I am writing to express my full support for the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan/ Natural Communities Conservation Plan and urge Mayor Reed and the San Jose City Council to not suspend work on the Plan. After spending nearly a decade of San Jose resources and taxpayer dollars working on this plan, it is not financial responsibly to cease involvement in the Habitat Plan process when it is so close to being completed.

The draft Habitat Plan proposed in December 2010 provides the basis for an economically and scientifically sound approach to protecting endangered/threatened species and their habitat, and it is imperative that the plan maintain its regional, long-term approach to maintain the quality of life for residents of Santa Clara County. I encourage the San Jose City Council to support a Habitat Plan that ensures the following:

1. **Comprehensive:** the Plan should include the entire proposed 520,000 acres and maintain its integrity as an integrated HCP/NCCP providing coverage for both federal and state listed species.
2. **Long-term:** the Plan needs to be at least 30 years in length, and preferably longer, in order to effectively respond to the long-term cumulative impacts of development over decades. The Plan should adequately fund permanent protection, enhancement and adaptive management of habitat in response to the permanent habitat destruction that will be permitted as a result of approval.
3. **Beneficial:** the Plan should conserve the most healthy, biologic spaces of reserve in contiguous formations and improve the quality of the natural environment while streamlining obligatory mitigation.
4. **Integrated, innovative, and pragmatic:** the Plan should work with the partners, wildlife agencies, environmental organizations, farmers, ranchers, and other stakeholders to ensure that it taps into our local capacities for innovative problem solving.
5. **Public-Private partnerships are key to success:** Such as the appropriate balance between easement and fee-title acquisition of properties.
6. **Scientific:** while it should go without saying, the Plan must be based on the best science, independently monitored, and adjusted appropriately over time.
7. **Implementation:** the Plan should be managed by an independent agency, including a citizens advisory committee with authority to effect decisions. To be a financial as well as biological success any proposed plan must pay for itself.

The Habitat Plan will only protect and maintain our quality of life if it protects the most ecological valuable land in our county and encourages development within our urban boundaries. We encourage you to move forward with a Habitat Plan that continues to uphold the integrity of the Plan's original goals.

Sincerely,
Cathy Trujillo
Volunteer for Habitat Conservation Now & City Employee