



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Memo to the Planning Commission AUGUST 2, 2017

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

*Project Name:* 2017 State Housing Legislation Briefing  
*Requested by:* San Francisco Planning Commission  
*Staff Contact:* James Pappas, Policy Planner- (415) 575-9053  
[james.pappas@sfgov.org](mailto:james.pappas@sfgov.org)  
*Reviewed by:* AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor

### BACKGROUND

The current California legislative session includes a large number of housing-related bills. The City Planning Commission (Commission) requested a hearing for May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017 to better understand how these bills might impact housing policy and land use. The Planning Department (Department) prepared the original version of this memo for the presentation to the Commission at that hearing. Due to changes in the content of the bills and recent votes in both legislative houses, the Department has decided to update this memo to help Commissioners and the public with tracking the bills' potential impacts.

The proposed bills address the state's housing crisis in varied ways including housing funding, housing approvals, and data collection. The Department has chosen to focus on bills related to the work of the Commission in three broad areas: 1) Ensuring Housing Production, 2) Housing Data Reporting, and 3) Inclusionary Housing and Rent Control. Given the large volume of housing-related legislation this report focuses on bills that we think could have significant impacts on housing and land use planning statewide and in San Francisco. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) may provide an update on the content of the fiscally-oriented housing bills at a later time.

### LEGISLATIVE STEPS

Please note that the State Senate and Assembly are currently on summer recess. No changes can occur to the bills until after the state legislature reconvenes on August 21st. In July, Governor Jerry Brown and legislative leaders announced that they were postponing a vote on a package of bills until congress is reconvened in August.<sup>1</sup> A joint statement issued by Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon said:

---

<sup>1</sup> Dillon, Liam. "Governor Jerry Brown, California legislative leaders commit to push an affordable housing plan next month", Los Angeles Times, July 17, 2017. Retrieved on August 1, 2017 from: <http://www.latimes.com/politics/essential/la-pol-ca-essential-politics-updates-governor-legislative-leaders-commit-to-1500335008-htm1story.html>

“Astronomical housing costs are straining family budgets and stressing employees who can’t afford to live where they work. That’s unacceptable, and it’s why the affordable housing crisis has been one of our top priorities.

“The package of legislation we are all working on will help ensure Californians won’t have to pay an arm and a leg to have a roof over their head. It will include a general obligation bond, a permanent funding source for affordable housing and regulatory reform. This comprehensive approach does what’s long been needed in California – build new homes and improve access to housing. We look forward to finalizing this package upon return from summer recess.”<sup>2</sup>

The specific bills contained in the package have not yet been disclosed.

## BILL SUMMARIES

This report reviews proposed housing bills as grouped into three categories: 1) Ensuring Housing Production; 2) Housing Data Reporting; and 3) Inclusionary Housing and Rent Control.

### 1. Ensuring Housing Production

**SB 35**, introduced by Senator Scott Weiner, would provide streamlining of housing approvals during a housing shortage. The bill would require cities to report annually to the state on housing approvals and production including data on affordability, tenure type, and progress toward meeting regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) targets. The bill would require the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to track performance on housing approvals and production over reporting periods covering the first and second halves of the eight year RHNA cycle. A jurisdiction that has not met RHNA goals over a reporting period would be required over the next reporting period to offer a streamlined, ministerial approval process that would not be subject to conditional use permits if developments meet certain criteria:

- In jurisdictions that have not met RHNA goals for above-moderate income housing approvals in the prior reporting period, all code-complying housing developments would be streamlined. Developments with over 10 units would need to meet local inclusionary affordable housing requirements or, if there is no local requirement, make 10% of units affordable for Low Income households earning 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). San Francisco appears has met RHNA goals for above moderate income housing in recent RHNA reporting periods. For this reason, staff anticipates that above-moderate housing projects would not be streamlined in San Francisco.
- In jurisdictions that have not met RHNA goals for production of housing affordable to Low Income households in the prior reporting period, code-complying developments with 50% or more of units affordable to Low income households would be streamlined. San Francisco generally has not been able to meet RHNA goals for this income category. For this reason, staff anticipates that these below-market-rate housing projects would be streamlined in San Francisco.

---

<sup>2</sup> Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon. “Governor Brown, Senate President pro Tempore and Assembly Speaker Issue Statement on Housing” July 17, 2017. Retrieved on August 1, 2017 from: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=19878>

- Developments must include two or more multifamily units and be at least two thirds residential.
- Developments need to be consistent with objective zoning standards and objective design review standards in effect at the time that the development is submitted.
- Developments must be located in a census-designated urbanized area or urban cluster or on a site where 75% of the perimeter adjoins developed urban uses.
- Developments must not demolish rent-controlled units, income-targeted affordable units, residential units occupied within the last 10 years, or a historic structure placed on a national, state, or local register.
- Developments must pay at least prevailing wage to all construction workers.

**SB 35 Status:** *Passed by the Senate, passed by Assembly Local Government and Housing and Community Development Committees, referred to Assembly Rules Committee.*

**AB 72**, introduced by Assembly Members Miguel Santiago and David Chiu, would task the state's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) with assessing compliance with housing element law and other statutes meant to encourage housing production, housing affordability, and equitable planning. The bill would authorize HCD to notify the state's Attorney General that jurisdictions are out of compliance with state housing law. The bill specifically addresses compliance with the [Housing Accountability Act](#)<sup>3</sup>, [Housing Element Inventory statute](#)<sup>4</sup>, [Density Bonus Law & Other Incentives](#)<sup>5</sup>, and [Anti-discrimination Statute for Environmental Justice in Planning & Land Use](#)<sup>6</sup>.

**AB 72 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by the Senate Committees on Transportation and Housing and Appropriations.*

**AB 73**, introduced by Assembly Member David Chiu, would allow cities to create housing sustainability districts that would facilitate approval of housing developments and would allow cities to apply to the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for zoning incentive payments of a still undefined amount. The payments would be based on the number of units in the district and depend on 1) approval of the district by HCD and a completed EIR and 2) issued permits for housing development. The District requirements would include:

- A limit of 15% of a city's land area per district and up to 30% of land area in all districts.
- Prevailing wage paid to workers on projects of 10 or more units within the district.
- At least 20% of new units must be affordable to very low, low, or moderate income households.

---

<sup>3</sup> Housing Accountability Act, as defined by Section 65589.5 of the CA Government Code available at:

[http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65589.5](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65589.5)

<sup>4</sup> Housing Element Inventory statute, as defined by Section 65863 of the CA Government Code available at:

[http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65863](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65863)

<sup>5</sup> Density Bonus Law & Other Incentives, as defined by Section 65915 of the CA Government Code available at:

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65915](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65915)

<sup>6</sup> Anti-discrimination Statute for Environmental Justice in Planning & Land Use, as defined by Section 65008 of the CA Government available at: Code [http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65008](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=65008)

- Replacement of income-targeted affordable or rent-controlled units demolished in the district.
- Eligible districts must have access to transit and other infrastructure.
- Ministerial approval for complying housing developments in the district.
- A written decision on an application for a residential development permit within a housing sustainability district must be issued within 120 days of submittal unless the applicant and approving authority agree to extend the time frame.
- Housing developments that meet all specified requirements of the housing sustainability district will not be subject to CEQA as long as the district has been approved by OPR and that has a completed EIR
- An ability to charge project fees to pay for the costs of planning and administering the district.
- Adoption of design review standards to facilitate project approval and quality design.
- Annual monitoring by HCD.

**AB 73 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, Passed by Senate Committees on Transportation and Housing, Environmental Quality, Governance and Finance, and Appropriations.*

**SB 166**, introduced by Senator Nancy Skinner, would add to existing requirements that jurisdictions identify housing sites in their housing element sufficient to accommodate their share of RHNA by requiring that jurisdictions make written findings on development of sites that produced fewer units by income level than identified in the housing element. If the jurisdiction reduces residential density, allows development at a lower residential density than originally assumed, or permits development with fewer units by income level than identified for that parcel in the housing element, the jurisdiction will need to comply with the following:

- A reduction must be consistent with the adopted general plan, including the housing element.
- If the remaining sites identified in the housing element can accommodate the jurisdiction's share of RHNA, the jurisdiction must provide a quantification of remaining unmet need at each income level and remaining capacity of identified sites to accommodate that need by income level.
- If the remaining sites in the housing element cannot accommodate the jurisdiction's share of RHNA, the jurisdiction must identify sufficient additional, adequate, and available sites with equal or greater residential density so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity.
- If a development approval results in fewer units by income level than identified for that parcel in the housing element and the jurisdiction does not find that remaining identified sites are adequate to accommodate its share of RHNA by income level, the jurisdiction is required to identify and make available additional adequate sites to accommodate its share of RHNA by income level within 180 days.

This bill would require work on the part of the Planning Department to track development of identified sites relative to unit production by income level and to identify additional sites if necessary.

**SB 166 Status:** *Passed by the Senate, passed by the Assembly Committees on Local Government and Housing and Community Development and re-referred to the Rules Committee.*

**SB 167** introduced by Senator Nancy Skinner, is essentially identical to **AB 678** introduced by Assembly Member Raul Bocanegra. Both bills would strengthen the Housing Accountability Act by setting new standards for jurisdictions that disapprove or impose density reductions or conditions on a housing development that otherwise complies with a local zoning ordinance and general plan. These standards would include the following:

- Shifts requirement to “preponderance” of the evidence from “substantial” evidence in the record to support the jurisdiction’s action.
- The preponderance of the evidence would have to show a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety and would have to show that there is not a satisfactory method other than the disapproval, reduction in density, or imposition of conditions to mitigate or avoid the adverse impact.
- Requires local agencies to issue written findings in case of disapproval, reduction in density, or imposition of conditions on otherwise compliant projects and shifts burden to local legislative body.
- Allows legal recourse for projects that have been inappropriately disapproved or where density has been reduced.
- Allows for imposition of a fine when jurisdictions do not respond to court rulings against the disapproval, reduction in density, or imposition of conditions. These fines would fund affordable housing.

**SB 167 Status:** Passed by the Senate, Passed by the Assembly Committees on Housing and Community Development and Local Government and re-referred to Rules Committee.

**SB 540**, introduced by Senator Richard Roth, authorizes cities to create Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones that would include an EIR, with identified mitigation measures, and adoption of a specific plan which would facilitate housing approvals. The bill would:

- Allow jurisdictions to apply to HCD for no-interest loan to cover costs of creating the plan and completing the EIR and to charge a development fee to repay the loan.
- Limit the number of total units and the percentage of RHNA allocation that could be located within a zone.
- Require that 50% of all housing built or rehabilitated within the zone be affordable to low and moderate income households with 30% of units affordable at moderate income, 15% of units affordable at low income, and 5 % of units affordable to very low income households.
- Expedite approval for five years after the adoption of the plan for housing developments that comply with the plan including objective design standards and required mitigation measures.
- Require that housing developments that are primarily affordable to above moderate income households to make 10% of units affordable units or, if there is a local inclusionary requirement that is higher than 10%, the local requirement applies.
- Require qualifying developments in the zone to pay at least prevailing wage to construction workers.

**SB 540 Status:** Passed by the Senate, passed by the Assembly Committees on Local Government and Natural Resources and re-referred to the Appropriations Committee.

**AB 932**, introduced by Assembly Member Phil Ting, would permit San Francisco along with Emeryville, Los Angeles, Oakland, or San Diego to declare a “shelter crisis” which would allow these jurisdictions to adopt by ordinance “reasonable local standards and procedures for the design, site development, and operation of homeless shelters” including health and safety standards in lieu of compliance with state or local law to the extent that strict compliance with state and local laws and standards would prevent mitigation of the crisis. During the crisis, requirements that homeless shelters must be consistent with local land use plans, including the general plan, would be suspended. These jurisdictions would similarly be able to adopt by ordinance “reasonable local building, planning, and zoning standards and procedures for the design, site development, and operation of permanent supportive housing” in lieu of compliance with state and local standards and laws. Permanent supportive housing would not be exempt from local land use plans.

Jurisdictions that declare a shelter crisis would need to develop a plan by July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 to address the crisis. The plan would need to address the development of homeless shelters and permanent supportive housing. Beginning on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 and continuing annually until January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 a jurisdiction declaring a shelter emergency would need to report to the Senate and Assembly on the status of the effort to address homelessness as indicated by specific criteria.

**AB 932 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by the Senate Committees on Transportation and Housing and Judiciary and re-referred to Appropriations Committee with recommendation to consent calendar.*

**AB 1397**, introduced by Assembly Member Evan Low, would strengthen housing element law to ensure that properties included in the inventory of potential housing development sites have a realistic chance of being developed. The bill would specifically include the following requirements:

- Properties in the inventory of housing development sites would have to be listed by parcel number.
- Sites included in the inventory of properties that can accommodate housing development would need to have “realistic and demonstrated” potential for housing development.
- Sites included in the housing element that are currently zoned for non-residential use must allow redevelopment for residential use or be part of a program to rezone for residential use.
- Parcels included in the inventory must have sufficient sewer, water, and dry utilities to support housing development or must be part of “a general plan program or other mandatory program or plan, including a program or plan of a public or private entity providing water or sewer service to secure sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities ... to support housing development.”
- Sites included in the inventory would have to be analyzed to show that they can accommodate a portion of the jurisdiction’s share of regional housing need by income level.
- Non-vacant sites included in two or more consecutive planning periods where housing development has not been approved could not be deemed appropriate to accommodate a portion of the jurisdictions housing need for low income households unless the site is zoned to meet

minimum residential density standards and is part of a program to allow housing use by right if a minimum of 20% of units are affordable to Lower income households.

- Jurisdictions including sites of ½ an acre or less or site of 10 acres or more would have to demonstrate that development has successfully occurred on such sites in the past.
- The methodology for identifying sites for housing development would have to demonstrate that an existing use on non-vacant sites is not an impediment to housing development, including past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development.
- Housing development that results in the demolition of a unit targeted to low income households, serving low income households, or subject to rent control would have to be replaced with a unit of equal or lower affordability. This requirement would apply to housing developments built on sites where units meeting this criteria have been vacant or were demolished in the last 5 years.

San Francisco currently meets the requirement to identify sufficient sites to accommodate its share of regional housing needs through an analysis of all parcels in the city. The analysis assesses current development on each site relative to zoned capacity to identify sites with significant residential development potential. Many of the requirements of AB 1397 could likely be met by including additional analysis of recent developments to show that (1) sites of a variety of sizes have been redeveloped as housing, (2) that non-vacant sites with non-residential uses also have been redeveloped as housing, and (3) that income-targeted affordable housing has been developed on these types of sites.

While most provisions of the bill could likely be addressed with relatively limited amounts of staff time there are a few requirements that could require more staff time or action by the Commission. An example is the requirement that sites that have been included in housing element inventories over consecutive planning periods without seeing housing approvals could only be included in another inventory as accommodating housing for lower income households if residential use is allowed by right for housing developments that provide at least 20% of units as affordable to low income households. This provision of the bill could require additional analysis by staff and potentially action by the Commission.

**AB 1397 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by Senate Committees on Transportation and Housing and Appropriations with recommendation to pass.*

**AB 1515**, introduced by Assembly Member Tom Daly, would strengthen the Housing Accountability Act and is meant to work in concert with SB 167 (and/or AB 678). The primary impact of the bill is that a housing development or emergency shelter would be deemed consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the housing development or emergency shelter is consistent, compliant, or in conformity, pursuant to the Housing Accountability Act.

**AB 1515 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee and re-referred to Rules Committee.*

## **2. Housing Data Reporting**

**AB 1423**, introduced by Assembly Member David Chiu, would extend the collection of housing-related data to include charter cities. Existing law exempts charter cities from certain reporting requirements for housing production in relation to need, as defined by RHNA. As one of more than 120 charter cities in California, San Francisco is currently exempted from reporting certain housing data to HCD and OPR. San Francisco voluntarily reports data because this data provides a critical resource for both the public and decision-makers to track regional housing outcomes and develop housing goals and policies. In addition, reporting data to the state increases eligibility to receive state funding for housing and open space. In April, the San Francisco Committee on State Legislation voted “support” in order to facilitate housing policy decisions and enforcement of housing related law.

**AB 1423 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly.*

**AB 1156**, introduced by Assembly Member Phil Ting, has been updated to require that housing elements include reporting on the number of households paying 30% and 50% or more in housing costs. Originally the bill would have required that Annual Housing Element Progress Reports include a listing of sites rezoned to accommodate that portion of the city or county’s share of RHNA for each income level that cannot be accommodated on the sites identified in the inventory required by existing Housing Element law.

**AB 1156 Status:** *Passed by Assembly.*

## **3. Inclusionary Housing and Rent Control**

**AB 1505**, introduced by Assembly Member Richard Bloom along with Assembly Member David Chiu and Assembly Member Todd Gloria (Senator Scott Weiner and Assembly Member Phil Ting are listed as coauthors), would provide the much-awaited “Palmer Fix”. The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (1995) prevents the city from placing rent control on new construction, condominiums, tenancy-in-commons, or single family homes. The Palmer decision (2009) expanded the applicability of Costa Hawkins to apply to rents on new affordable units in new rental developments. Taken together, Costa Hawkins and the Palmer decision present a significant challenge to the ability of California cities to create new affordable, rental housing. This bill would restore the ability of local jurisdictions to require inclusionary rental housing on site but otherwise would not change Costa-Hawkins.

**AB 1505 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by Senate Transportation and Housing Committee with recommendation to pass.*



**AB 1506**, introduced by Assembly Member Richard Bloom, Assembly Member David Chiu, and Assembly Member Rob Bonta, would completely repeal the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act that limits application of local rent control on new construction, condominiums, tenancy-in-commons, or single family homes. The repeal of Costa-Hawkins would restore cities' ability to impose rent-control on all housing types and would also restore vacancy control, allowing cities to restrict how much rents can rise upon vacancy. This bill has much broader implications than the limited changes in AB 1505, which is targeted specifically at restoring cities' ability to require inclusionary rental units.

**AB 1506 Status:** *Referred to Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.*

**AB 915**, introduced by Assembly Member Phil Ting, would require the City and County of San Francisco to subject all of the units in new developments to the city's affordable inclusionary percentage requirement. This bill would specify that "bonus units" within projects that utilize the state density bonus law are subject to inclusionary requirements unless specifically exempted by the City and County. The bill would not apply to housing developments with an application submitted or processed before January 1, 2018.

**AB 915 Status:** *Passed by the Assembly, passed by the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee with recommendation to pass.*

#### **REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION**

None. This memo is informational only.

**From:** [MayorsPressOffice\\_MYR \(MYR\)](#)  
**To:** [MayorsPressOffice\\_MYR \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** \*\*\* MEDIA ADVISORY \*\*\* MAYOR EDWIN M. LEE'S SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC EVENTS FOR WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2017  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 01, 2017 6:11:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [8.2.17 Media Advisory.pdf](#)

---

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**

Tuesday, August 1, 2017

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

**\*\*\* MEDIA ADVISORY \*\*\***

**MAYOR EDWIN M. LEE'S SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC EVENTS FOR  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2017**

Mayor Lee has no public events.

*Note: Mayor's schedule is subject to change.*

**###**

**From:** [MayorsPressOffice\\_MYR \(MYR\)](#)  
**To:** [MayorsPressOffice\\_MYR \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** \*\*\* MEDIA ADVISORY \*\*\* MAYOR EDWIN M. LEE'S SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC EVENTS FOR  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 02, 2017 6:11:29 PM  
**Attachments:** [8.3.17 Media Advisory.pdf](#)

---

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**

Wednesday, August 2, 2017

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

**\*\*\* MEDIA ADVISORY \*\*\***

**MAYOR EDWIN M. LEE'S SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC EVENTS FOR  
THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 2017**

Mayor Lee has no public events.

*Note: Mayor's schedule is subject to change.*

###

**From:** [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Gerber, Patricia \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Kern, Chris \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: ACA comments on SFPUC Alameda Creek Recapture Project  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 02, 2017 10:31:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [ACA comment letter ACRP 8-2-17.pdf](#)

---

*Office of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)  
[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

**From:** Alameda Creek [mailto:[alamedacreekalliance@gmail.com](mailto:alamedacreekalliance@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 02, 2017 9:58 AM  
**To:** Secretary, Commissions (CPC); [richhillissf@yahoo.com](mailto:richhillissf@yahoo.com); Richards, Dennis (CPC); [planning@rodneymong.com](mailto:planning@rodneymong.com); Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC)  
**Subject:** ACA comments on SFPUC Alameda Creek Recapture Project

SF Planning Commissioners:

Attached please find comments of the Alameda Creek Alliance on the SFPUC's Alameda Creek Recapture Project.

--

Jeff Miller  
Director  
Alameda Creek Alliance  
(510) 499-9185  
[www.alamedacreek.org](http://www.alamedacreek.org)

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Johnson, Christine \(CPC\)](#); [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Rodney Fong](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Karl Hasz](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)  
**Cc:** [Gerber, Patricia \(CPC\)](#); [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Commission Update for Week of July 31, 2017  
**Date:** Monday, July 31, 2017 9:30:10 AM  
**Attachments:** [Commission Weekly Update 7.31.17.doc](#)

---

*Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)  
[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

---

**From:** Tsang, Francis  
**Sent:** Monday, July 31, 2017 8:48 AM  
**To:** Tsang, Francis  
**Subject:** Commission Update for Week of July 31, 2017

Colleagues,

Please find a memo attached that outlines items before commissions and boards for this week. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks!  
Francis

**Francis Tsang**  
Deputy Chief of Staff  
Office of Mayor Edwin M. Lee  
415.554.6467 | [francis.tsang@sfgov.org](mailto:francis.tsang@sfgov.org)



**Get Connected with Mayor Ed Lee**

[www.sfmayor.org](http://www.sfmayor.org)

Twitter @mayoredlee

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Johnson, Christine \(CPC\)](#); [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Rodney Fong](#)  
**Cc:** [Gerber, Patricia \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Memo for the Commission During Their Recess  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 02, 2017 4:43:35 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[Status of State Housing Bills for Planning Commission 08.02.17.pdf](#)

---

*Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)  
[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

---

**From:** Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 02, 2017 2:55 PM  
**To:** CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY  
**Cc:** Pappas, James (CPC)  
**Subject:** Memo for the Commission During Their Recess

Dear Jonas,

As discussed, pls distribute the attached memo to the Planning Commission and public. This memo is a follow-up to the Commission's May 11, 2017 hearing on pending state legislation pertaining to housing. This memo is not associated with any upcoming hearing, but is offered in response to their request to be periodically updated. As the governor and leaders of the state legislature have announced their intent to prioritize housing after recess, an update to the Commission is timely.

Thank you,

**AnMarie Rodgers**  
**Senior Policy Advisor**

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.558.6395 | Fax: 415.558.6409  
Email: [anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org](mailto:anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org)  
Web: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Legislative.Affairs>  
Property Info Map: <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/>

