Dear Mr. Winslow,

Good morning and Happy New Year.

The DR Requestor makes a valid point about this project actually being a Demo and needing a CUA.

I support their contention that it should be a CUA. Below are the online appraisals of 830 Olmstead and obviously they are below the Zoning Administrator’s value for an Administrative Approval of a Demolition which is currently $1.9 million.

It would probably be difficult to get comps at or above the $1.9 million level, if not impossible. (In 2017 it took two rounds of appraisals to get the comps to allow the Demolition of 653 28th Street, which was a very varied and solid RH-1 property, but that appraisal came in at just over $200k from the value at the time, which was $2.5 million.)

I hope the Commission will give a close look at the accuracy and the squishy logic of these Demo Calcs for this proposed project and give serious consideration to the potential for a CUA, and most notably the recent history of residential development throughout San Francisco. Plus they are correct in pointing out that the permit valuation seems very, very low at $250k for a project of this magnitude given current costs.

I also want to mention 79 Cragmont which was also an RH-1 project that ultimately needed to go through a CUA after it was accidentally demolished, is currently going through an Administrative Approval by the Department as an Alteration in the past few years as well as the other notorious projects.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Georgia Schuttish
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  
Thursday, January 10, 2019  
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED, SUPERVISOR RAFAEL MANDELMAN, AND COMMUNITY LEADERS CELEBRATE THE REOPENING OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Under the RAD program, 90 affordable apartments renovated for seniors and people with disabilities

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, and community leaders today rededicated 90 newly renovated affordable apartments for seniors and people with disabilities.

The former public housing site at 25 Sanchez Street is one of 29 properties previously owned by the San Francisco Housing Authority that was renovated under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, which allows for a voluntary, permanent conversion of public housing to privately-owned, permanently affordable housing. The project is part of the City’s commitment to preserving and revitalizing 3,500 distressed public housing units across San Francisco. To date, more than 2,500 apartments have been renovated under the program.

“The continued rehabilitation of affordable housing in San Francisco has a huge impact on the
lives of the people living there, and today 90 seniors and people with disabilities have a new, safe place to call home,” said Mayor Breed. “I grew up in public housing and I remember what those conditions were like. Seeing these residents return to their new homes is a testament to what we are accomplishing for vulnerable households across the City.”

The renovation of 25 Sanchez focused on improving the quality of life for residents and longevity of the building. Under the provisions of the RAD program, no residents were displaced, all residents moved back into their revitalized apartments, and all continue to pay 30% of their income for rent.

“Despite having one of the highest rates of evictions and displacement in the city, District 8 has seen very little creation of new affordable housing,” said Supervisor Mandelman. “The RAD Program allows us to rehabilitate our precious existing affordable housing stock and maintain our critical supply of affordable units while improving the lives of tenants in buildings like 25 Sanchez.”

“As we celebrate the 13th grand reopening of a RAD development, we are thrilled to see more former public housing transformed into beautiful, safe, and stable housing for the City’s most vulnerable tenants. It’s especially exciting for a property like 25 Sanchez in the Castro/Upper Market neighborhood that has such a great need for affordable housing,” said Kate Hartley, Director, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development.

Co-developers BRIDGE Housing and Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA) oversaw the extensive rehabilitation of residents’ apartments and community spaces. The primary scope of work included life safety and accessibility improvements, residential room renovations, voluntary structural upgrades, sprinkler system upgrades, replacement of original building systems and equipment, energy use reduction and improved elevator access. Revitalized amenities also include a community room and laundry room. The property has access to public transportation, with well-utilized bus and light-rail lines offering frequent service throughout San Francisco.

“25 Sanchez showcases the collaborative power when City officials, funders, stakeholders, partners, community members and the property’s residents themselves come together for a common purpose: the preservation of affordable housing so seniors and people with disabilities can age in place with dignity,” stated MEDA Chief Executive Officer Luis Granados.

“Affordable housing is a precious resource, and it’s essential for any city that strives to maintain diversity and inclusivity. We’re proud to be part of the public-private RAD partnership in San Francisco, which is preserving housing opportunities for the long term and improving the lives of some of our most vulnerable community members,” said Cynthia Parker, President and CEO of BRIDGE.

“Financing all 29 properties of SF RAD, the largest affordable housing renovation project in the nation, with $2.1 billion from Bank of America Merrill Lynch is no small feat, especially with the goal of not displacing vulnerable tenants like the seniors and disabled households at 25 Sanchez. The life-safety upgrades and modernization efforts to improve the quality of life for these residents helps fulfill Mayor Breed’s vision of providing safe and secure affordable housing, and makes us all proud to be part of such an important public-private effort,” said Liz Minick, San Francisco-East Bay Market executive at Bank of America, which provided a
$22.8 million tax-exempt construction loan to make the project possible. “To help ease the transition during renovation periods for residents, an additional $2.8 million from Bank of America helps fund social services, wellness activities and other resources for SF RAD properties such as 25 Sanchez.”

###
Commissioners,

Please be advised that the Olmstead St. DR on your Agenda tomorrow must be continued.

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
www.sfplanning.org
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Wednesday, January 9, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED CELEBRATES OPENING OF NEW BRYANT STREET NAVIGATION CENTER

New facility builds on Mayor Breed’s plan to open 1,000 new shelter beds and will provide care and services to 84 homeless residents

San Francisco, CA—Mayor London N. Breed today celebrated the grand opening of the Bryant Street Navigation Center alongside Assemblymember Phil Ting, and partners CalTrans and Google.org. The Navigation Center will provide support and services for up to 84 clients at a time.

The Navigation Center opening helps advance Mayor Breed’s plan to open 1,000 new shelter beds by 2020. Bryant Street is currently the sixth Navigation Center open and operating in San Francisco. As of December 2018, Navigation Centers have successfully transitioned 621 individuals into permanent housing, found temporary placements for 125 others, and helped another 1,234 individuals exit homelessness through the Homeward Bound program.
“Addressing our homelessness crisis requires creating paths for people to get into housing and receive the care they need, which is why I’m committed to opening 1,000 new shelter beds in San Francisco. This Navigation Center not only expands our capacity to help our homeless population, it also provides separate, dedicated spaces for homeless women,” said Mayor Breed. “This project is another example of what we can accomplish by working with our state representatives and local partners to help our most vulnerable residents.”

Bryant Street is the second Navigation Center to be constructed on land leased from Caltrans, following the opening of the Division Circle Navigation Center in August 2018. Google.org provided a $3 million grant to help cover construction costs.

As a result of AB 857, introduced by Assemblymember Phil Ting, the City is able to use underutilized Caltrans locations like this one for emergency food and shelter programs at affordable rates. Assemblymemeber Ting additionally helped secure $27.6 million in funding through the Homeless Emergency Aid Program, which will be used to support existing navigation centers, adult and transitional age youth rapid rehousing, and shelters replacement.

“I’m excited to see another Navigation Center open on CalTrans property. State and local partnerships are the key to tackling San Francisco’s homelessness crisis,” said Assemblymember Phil Ting. “That’s why I championed $500 million in last year’s state budget to establish the Homeless Emergency Aid Program. San Francisco has already received a $27.6 million program grant for more shelters and services, and I look forward to working with Mayor Breed to see the impact of this investment.”

Bryant Street is unique in that it provides 20 beds specifically for women in a separate wing of the facility that is only accessible to women, including a women’s only outdoor area. Navigation Centers are designed to serve San Franciscans struggling with homelessness who are often resistant to traditional shelters. Unlike traditional shelters, they allow people to bring their partners, pets, and belongings with them. In addition to room and board, case managers provide support to connect them with employment opportunities, health services, public benefits, and permanent housing.

“I would like to thank all of the partners that came together to make this new Navigation Center a reality,” said Jeff Kositsky, Director of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. “Navigation Centers play an important role in the City’s homelessness response system providing a low-barrier point of entry for people on our streets. The dedicated resources for women here will bring additional trauma informed care to an especially vulnerable population.”

Like other Navigation Centers, access to Bryant Street comes from referral from the Encampment Resolution Team, which focuses on resolving long term encampments, and the Homeless Outreach Team, which provides care management and medical services to homeless individuals.

“We are grateful to Caltrans for stepping up and opening its land for this important project,” said San Francisco Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, whose team led the planning and design phases for the new Navigation Center. “The innovative partnership between San Francisco and the state is exactly what’s needed to help tackle one of our biggest challenges by moving people off the streets and into a supportive environment where they can get safe shelter and needed services.”
“Caltrans is proud to partner with the City of San Francisco on this project,” said Caltrans Director Laurie Berman. “When government agencies, elected officials, and the private sector join forces, we find greater success in addressing the needs of our fellow citizens in a compassionate and lasting way.”

Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco (ECS) will operate the Bryant Street Navigation Center. In addition to Bryant, ECS also operates the Central Waterfront Navigation Center and previously operated the original Mission Navigation Center prior to its closure in October.

“This Navigation Center is a critical tool in a broader effort to drive systemic change and solve problems of homelessness more effectively on a larger scale,” said Episcopal Community services Executive Director, Beth Stokes. “Navigation Centers provide low-barrier, low-threshold respite from the streets for a highly vulnerable population, in tandem with on-site case management, streamlined access to social services and coordinated entry into housing pathways. We are building the foundation of a new system to end homelessness and this lays a cornerstone.”

“We wanted to do our part to ensure that this Navigation Center became a reality,” stated Google California Public Affairs Lead Rebecca Prozan. “Since 2014, we've provided $63 million of grants to the city's non-profit organizations, nearly a quarter of which has been directed to aiding homeless, and we're so happy that this latest $3 million grant from Google.org was able to cover the majority of the construction costs for the center and expedite the process of getting vital services to those in our community who need them most.”

The Homeless Outreach Team has already placed 34 guests at Bryant Navigation Center and will be working to fill it over the next few weeks.
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
www.sfplanning.org

From: gary laufman <garyphoto@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 9:35 PM
To: Zushi, Kei (CPC) <kei.zushi@sfgov.org>
Cc: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; laurelheights2016@gmail.com; Richard Frisbie <frfbeagle@gmail.com>; richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <Milicent.Johnson@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <Joel.Koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 3333 California St.

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

I am in Support for the Community Alternatives.
I am in Opposition to the Developers’ Destructive Proposal.
I am saddened by the decline of the quality of living in San Francisco.

If you’re not planning to protect or improve the quality of living in SF then why do it?

Gary Laufman
San Francisco resident for 30+ years

3251 Washington St. #301
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
To: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: Case No. 2015-014028ENV, 3333 Calif. St. DEIR Comments
Date: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 9:37:17 AM
Attachments: 3333CaliforniaDEIRcomments.pdf

To: CPC.3333CaliforniaEIR <CPC.3333CaliforniaEIR@sfgov.org>
Cc: Zushi, Kei (CPC) <kei.zushi@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <Joel.Koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <Milicent.Johnson@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; 'Rich Hillis' <richhillissf@gmail.com>; 'Rodney Fong' <planning@rodneyfong.com>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Subject: Case No. 2015-014028ENV, 3333 Calif. St. DEIR Comments

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

To: Kei Zushi, Sr. Planner, through email ID for 3333 California St. Project <CPC(dot)3333CaliforniaEIR(at)sfgov(dot)org>
Please see attached document.

Commissions Secretary: Please route to Director of Planning. Thank you very much.

Rose Hillson
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
www.sfplanning.org

From: Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 3:28 PM
To: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ON THE ELECTION OF BOARD PRESIDENT NORMAN YEE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Tuesday, January 8, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** STATEMENT ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ON THE ELECTION OF BOARD PRESIDENT NORMAN YEE

“I want to congratulate Supervisor Norman Yee on being elected to serve as President of the Board of Supervisors. As a former Board President, I know firsthand the responsibility that comes with serving in this role, which includes working collaboratively with all members of the Board to improve the lives of everyone in San Francisco. I look forward to working with President Yee to create more housing for all San Franciscans, help our homeless residents get the care and shelter they need, and keep our streets clean and safe.”

###
From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To: Zushi, Kei (CPC)
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: 3333 Calif
Date: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 10:39:01 AM
Attachments:
Re DEIR - Case No. 2015014028ENV Project Title 3333 California Street MixedUse Project Zoning Residential Mixed Low Density RM1 .msg
Comments on 3333 Project.msg
Project Title 3333 California Street Mixed Use Project - Comments on the Draft EIR.msg
Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday January 8 2019.msg
draft EIP for 3333 California.msg
Comments on 3333 California Project.msg
3333 California Street Mixed Use Project.msg
3333 California St. DEIR.msg
Discrepancies and Comments with 3333 California St. DEIR.msg
3333 California Street.msg
DEIR for 3333 California St..msg
DEIR 3333 California Street.msg
Comments on 3333 California project.msg
3333 California Street.msg
DEIR 3333 California Street.msg
Discrepancies and Comments with 3333 California St. DEIR.msg
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

86 Dwellers
P. O. Box 421949
San Francisco, CA 94142-1949

January 5, 2019

RE: 2018-009178CUA
799 Van Ness Avenue
Planning Commission
1660 Mission Street 4th Floor Suite 400
Dear Commissioners & Planning Staff,

This project in RC-4 district to ask for conditional use Authorization for an unnamed gym.

Within one mile of this project there already 15 public gyms and numerous housing developments with fitness rooms.

The Executive committee doesn’t not see this proposal as proper use within the Van Ness Avenue commercial corridor which has been under construction for several years.

We request the commission deny the conditional use authorization and ask the project sponsor to do proper community outreach when we see no public comments in the Executive Summary we can assume very little if any community outreach was performed.

Executive committee

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Hello,
Attached please find the Castro CBD's letter of support for The Agency's CU, Planning case number is 2018-017008.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you,

Andrea Aiello
Executive Director
Castro/Upper Market CBD
ph: 415-500-1181
www.castrocbd.org
facebook.com/castrocbd
twitter.com/visitthecastro
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, January 7, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED INITIATES PLANS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND

A $300 million Affordable Housing Bond has been added into the City’s draft Capital Plan, moving up plans for an Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond.

San Francisco, CA — Today Mayor London N. Breed announced she will be moving forward an Affordable Housing Bond to build and preserve affordable housing in San Francisco. The Affordable Housing Bond, which would be placed on an upcoming ballot, has been added to the draft Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2028-29, which lays out the upcoming 10 year General Obligation (G.O.) Bond schedule. The prior version of the Capital Plan, approved in 2017, did not include an Affordable Housing Bond for upcoming elections. The updated G.O. Bond schedule has also moved up plans for an Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond to pay for seismic retrofitting and resiliency for critical public safety infrastructure to 2019, responding to critical seismic risks and needs in first responder and public-facing buildings.

The Mayor will be convening a stakeholder process to build support for both bonds, as one can run in November 2019 and the other can run in March 2020. In the current version of the draft Capital Plan, the Affordable Housing Bond is slated for 2020 and the ESER Bond is slated for 2019. These dates are placeholders and can be changed in the coming months. The
Mayor is committed to moving both bonds forward to create more affordable housing for San Francisco residents and ensure that all of our critical public safety infrastructure is safe and sound.

“We need to build more housing in San Francisco, especially badly needed affordable housing to help keep our communities stable. This requires us to invest in solutions to build homes for people who need them,” said Mayor Breed. “An Affordable Housing Bond is a key part of this strategy, and we are working now to move this effort forward so we can invest in more housing production to serve the people of San Francisco. We also know that our public safety infrastructure must be able to withstand any upcoming earthquakes. These are both key priorities for our City, and we will work in the coming weeks to bring people together and determine what elections makes the most sense for these bonds to be successful.”

Published every odd year, the 10-Year Capital Plan is a fiscally constrained expenditure plan that lays out infrastructure investments over the next decade. The City Administrator prepares the document with input from Citywide stakeholders, who have put forth their best ideas and most realistic estimates of San Francisco’s future needs.

The draft Capital Plan will be introduced at the next Capital Planning Committee (CPC) meeting on January 7, 2019. This draft version will be discussed at meetings over the next two months and modifications made, including changing the election dates for either bond. By March 1, 2019, the Proposed Capital Plan will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor for approval no later than May 1, 2019, per Admin Code Section 3.20.

###
Commissioners – Please see attached addendum.

Thank you,

Christine L. Silva  
Senior Planner, Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9085 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

FROM: Silva, Christine (CPC)  
TO: Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Rich Hillis  
CC: CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY; CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS; JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT)  
SUBJECT: RE: CPC Calendars for January 10, 2019 - Addendum  
DATE: Monday, January 07, 2019 12:02:59 PM  
ATTACHMENTS: 20190110_cal.addendum.pdf  
20190110_cal.addendum.docx

Attached are your Calendars for January 10, 2019, a relatively short one to ease you in to the new year.

Commissioner Richards,

Please review the previous hearing and materials for 3848 24th Street.

Cheers,

Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org  
www.sfplanning.org

FROM: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)  
SENT: Friday, January 04, 2019 12:16 PM  
TO: Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <Milicent.Johnson@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <Joel.Koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; planning@rodneyfong.com; Rich Hillis <richhillissf@gmail.com>  
CC: CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>; CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS <CPC.SeniorManagers@sfgov.org>; JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT) <Kristen.Jensen@sfcityatty.org>; STACY, KATE (CAT) <Kate.Stacy@sfcityatty.org>  
SUBJECT: CPC Calendars for January 10, 2019

Commissioners,

Happy New Year!

Attached are your Calendars for January 10, 2019, a relatively short one to ease you in to the new year.

Commissioner Richards,

Please review the previous hearing and materials for 3848 24th Street.

Cheers,

Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org  
www.sfplanning.org
Commissioners,

Happy New Year!

Attached are your Calendars for January 10, 2019, a relatively short one to ease you in to the new year.

Commissioner Richards,

Please review the previous hearing and materials for 3848 24th Street.

Cheers,

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
www.sfplanning.org
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
www.sfplanning.org

From: Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Sent: Friday, January 04, 2019 9:52 AM
To: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON N. BREED RELEASES FIVE-YEAR FISCAL PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, January 4, 2018
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON N. BREED RELEASES FIVE-YEAR FISCAL PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

While revenue growth is projected to continue, steps must be taken to address structural deficits in future years

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced the release of San Francisco’s Five-Year Financial Plan for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2019-20 through 2023-24. The Financial Plan projects that while the City will experience continued strong, but slowing, growth in tax revenues over the next five years, the cost of City services will outpace growth in tax revenues, resulting in ongoing structural deficits. If the City does not take corrective action, the projected gap between revenues and expenditures will increase from a deficit of $107 million in FY 2019-20 to approximately $644 million by FY 2023-24. The City’s budget deficit for the upcoming two fiscal years, FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, is projected to be approximately $271 million.

“We need to make sensible choices in the short-term because while we continue to enjoy good economic times and strong revenue growth, we know that we cannot expect that to continue forever,” said Mayor Breed. “I am committed to making sure we are helping the residents of our City who have the greatest needs, and that we are spending City funds
effectively and efficiently.”
In recent years, strong revenue growth has enabled the City to overcome budget deficits while also restoring and increasing important services to the public. Looking forward, however, the City cannot rely on continued revenue growth at the levels experienced in recent years. To ensure stability, the Financial Plan proposes a package of fiscal strategies aimed at slowing projected expenditure growth, including managing employee wage and benefit costs, as well as limiting non-personnel cost growth, and capital and debt restructuring. These fiscal strategies, if implemented, would still allow the City’s expenditures to grow by 16 percent over the next five years.

The Financial Plan does not assume excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) revenue in the forecast, though it was recently recognized as a windfall in the current budget year, due to the unpredictable nature of the funding source.

While the Financial Plan does not assume an economic downturn or any loss of state and federal revenue, the report does note that the United States is experiencing the second longest period of economic expansion since World War II, rendering the likelihood of a slowdown or decline in revenue growth increasingly likely over the next five years. Should an economic slowdown or loss in state or federal revenue occur, the fiscal strategies outlined in the Financial Plan would not be sufficient to close the large gaps between revenues and expenditures. The Financial Plan includes an assessment of the potential impact of an economic downturn on the City’s five-year outlook. In a recession scenario, the City would need to utilize economic reserves and make expenditure reductions to balance the budget.

Since the last economic recession, significant efforts and policy changes have been made to improve the City’s financial standing and better guard against the next financial downturn. Despite these efforts, the City is facing a persistent structural deficit, largely due to increases in employee costs, increases to voter mandated baselines and set-asides, and growing required contributions to support existing entitlement programs.

The Financial Plan projects that available General Fund revenue sources will increase by $759 million, or 14%, over the next five years. In comparison, total expenditures are projected to grow by $1.4 billion, or 25%, over the same time period, including: $598 million in employee salary, pension, and benefit cost growth (43 percent of total expenditure growth); $401 million in citywide operating cost increases (28 percent of total expenditure growth); $239 million in baseline and reserve growth (17 percent of total expenditure growth); and, $165 million in other departmental operating cost increases (12 percent of total expenditure growth).

The Five-Year Financial Plan is required under Proposition A, a charter amendment approved by voters in November 2009. The City Charter requires the plan to forecast expenditures and revenues during the five-year period, propose actions to balance revenues and expenditures during each year of the plan, and discuss strategic goals for City departments. The Financial Plan is co-authored by the Mayor’s Office, the Controller’s Office, and the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Legislative Analyst.

The Mayor must submit a balanced budget to the Board of Supervisors by June 1.
From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Rich Hillis; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Black, Kate (CPC); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ON SPEAKER NANCY PELOSI
Date: Thursday, January 03, 2019 11:00:26 AM
Attachments: 1.3.18 Speaker Pelosi.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
www.sfplanning.org

From: Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2019 10:59 AM
To: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ON SPEAKER NANCY PELOSI

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, January 3, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** STATEMENT ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED ON SPEAKER NANCY PELOSI

“I want to congratulate Speaker Nancy Pelosi on her return to leadership in Washington D.C. today. She is a fierce and dedicated leader who represents the best of San Francisco and our country, and I know she will continue to push for real Democratic values like protecting working people, making healthcare more affordable, and advancing the rights of all Americans. San Francisco stands proudly behind Speaker Pelosi as she retakes the gavel and leads Congress into this year and beyond.”

###
*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED, CITY DEPARTMENTS, AND COMMUNITY LEADERS CELEBRATE COMPLETION OF MOSCONE EXPANSION PROJECT

$551 million expansion provides increased capacity and public amenities, will help San Francisco’s tourism and hospitality industries meet growing demand

San Francisco, CA— Mayor London N. Breed today joined elected officials, City departments, tourism and hospitality industry leaders, and community representatives to celebrate the completion of the $551 million Moscone Expansion Project.

The project adds more than 305,000 square feet of functional area in addition to a host of new public benefits and amenities. With the completion of the project, the new Moscone Center will better meet growing demand for convention and tourism space and increase tax revenue for the City.

“The new Moscone Center is a world-class facility for a world-class city,” said Mayor London Breed. “With the completion of this expansion, San Francisco is taking a major step to support
and expand our tourism industry, while also serving residents in the surrounding area. This state-of-the-art facility exemplifies our commitment to sustainability, creates new flexible-use convention and tourism spaces, and supports the neighborhood with a host of new design and open-space improvements.”

The Moscone Center has hosted some of the most important conventions and product announcements in recent memory, providing the space and amenities for businesses and organizations from the United States and beyond to celebrate their achievements and anticipate the future. Some of these include Salesforce’s annual Dreamforce conference, Oracle’s annual Oracle OpenWorld convention, the Game Developers Conference, and groundbreaking medical conferences.

Convention activities help drive general hotel tax revenues for the City, which were anticipated to provide approximately $375 million of General Fund revenues in Fiscal Year 2018-19 budget. The expansion is also anticipated to create nearly 1,000 permanent jobs in San Francisco.

“The expansion of Moscone Center will have a lasting and positive impact on San Francisco’s economy,” said City Administrator Naomi Kelly. “In addition to the tax revenue and permanent jobs created, the expansion will provide new public spaces and pedestrian enhancements, weaving the Moscone Center into the surrounding neighborhood.”

The project implemented a number of urban design, streetscape and pedestrian safety changes that were designed to improve Moscone Center’s connection to the surrounding Yerba Buena neighborhood. The changes include wider sidewalks, open-air plazas, four additional public art installations, and enhanced landscaping and family-friendly play spaces to create a safer and more inviting neighborhood for residents and visitors. The San Francisco Public Works project team managed the Final Environmental Impact Report, development of design, secured all site permits, worked closely with multiple community groups to collect input on the proposed project design, and provided project management and construction management services.

“This project meets the demands of a 21st-century San Francisco with a design that is both functional and beautiful and adds to the vibrancy of the surrounding neighborhood,” said Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru. “Our partnerships with the hospitality sector and community groups to turn the Moscone expansion from idea to reality exemplifies San Francisco as a can-do city.”

The new Moscone Center is designed to meet LEED Platinum certification, and has the lowest carbon footprint per delegate of any major convention center in North America. It also has the largest rooftop solar panel array in San Francisco, which will provide the center with approximately 20 percent of its power. In addition, 15 million gallons of water will be recovered annually for reuse in landscaping, street cleaning and toilet flushing, and recycling and composting are included throughout the facility.

“San Francisco understands that we must be responsible and forward-thinking when it comes to water use,” said San Francisco Public Utilities Commission General Manager Harlan L. Kelly, Jr. “The expanded Moscone Convention Center, which will save as much as 15 million gallons of water a year through its new water reuse system, is a perfect example of that innovative spirit.”
With funding generated by the capital project, the San Francisco Arts Commission commissioned light artist Leo Villareal for the enclosed pedestrian bridge across Howard Street; Sarah Sze for the Park Bridge, spanning Howard Street; Christine Corday for a large outdoor sculpture on the north side of Howard Street; and Brendan Monroe for a large-scale mural on the Paseo Gallery wall. All artists were selected through a competitive public process and approved by the San Francisco Arts Commission. The Arts Commission also reinstalled works already in the Moscone collection, including the beloved Three Dancing Figures by Keith Haring.

The Moscone Expansion project follows a number of smaller renovations to the facility. In 2008, the City entered into a public-private partnership agreement with San Francisco Travel and the newly established San Francisco Tourism Improvement District (TID) to undertake a $56 million facelift of the existing Moscone interiors, including improving bathrooms, wayfinding, carpeting, movable walls, digital displays and other interior aesthetics. Following the completion of the initial renovations, the City explored future uses of the space. As a result, in 2012 and 2013, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development led negotiations to establish the public-private Moscone Expansion District (MED) partnership to fund the new $551 million renovation and expansion. The expansion project was funded through a combination of MED hotel revenue assessment and the City’s General Fund.

“The collaborative effort of this public private partnership is delivering substantial public benefits to the Yerba Buena neighborhood, creating hundreds of jobs and driving economic activity in a sustainable, responsible way,” said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. “Expanding the economic potential of this historic facility strengthens San Francisco’s status as a cultural destination now and into the future.”

“It is important that San Francisco stay competitive with expanded and upgraded convention facilities. This project has achieved that,” said Joe D’Alessandro, President and CEO of the San Francisco Travel Association. “Our two main goals have been to create contiguous space and flexibility for the Moscone Center. Now we have a brand-new center with state-of-the-art everything.”

Mayor Breed announced the rededication of the Moscone Center campus in honor of Mayor George Moscone, and the dedication of the South Lobby in honor of the late Mayor Edwin M. Lee, which includes a plaque recognizing the Mayor Edwin M. Lee South Lobby.

###
To whom it may concern:

I am writing in opposition to the developer’s plan for 3333 California Street. The proposal is objectionable for several reasons:

Architecture is not in line with existing neighborhood character.

Retail stores and offices will bring in too much additional traffic and are unnecessary. Existing local stores are more than sufficient for the needs of the neighborhood.

Parking is currently extremely difficult. The developer originally stated loading zones would be on-site or underground however that plan was scrapped. On-street loading zones would eliminate 40 additional street parking spaces.

15-year construction timeline is excessive and unnecessary and as costs spiral invites the sale of an up-zoned property.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE SATISFIES THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HOUSING IN SAN FRANCISCO BUT WITH SIGNIFICANTLY LESS DAMAGE TO THE ENVIRONMENT WHILE MAINTAINING THE CHARACTER OF
THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Sincerely,

Barbara and Jim Brenner

homeowners-1809 Lyon Street, San Francisco
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

San Francisco, CA— Mayor London N. Breed today joined community leaders to unveil newly installed streetlights in the Tenderloin District, which will better serve the neighborhood and help increase public safety as part of Mayor Breed’s commitment to improving the area.

The new streetlights were funded as part of the California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) Cathedral Hill Hospital Development Agreement in 2013, with $4.25 million provided by CPMC for 97 streetlights in the Tenderloin community.

“Since taking office, I have been out regularly in the Tenderloin talking to residents and merchants about how we can bring meaningful change and improve public safety for people who live and work in the community,” said Mayor Breed. “The increased lighting we are unveiling today is an important project that residents have asked for, and today we are...
delivering.”

As part of $9 million in funding for public improvements provided under the CPMC Development Agreement, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) was provided a community benefit grant of $4.25 million. With these funds, 97 new streetlights have been installed in the Tenderloin community between McAllister and O’Farrell Streets on Larkin, Hyde, Leavenworth, and Jones Streets, as well as on Eddy Street between Larkin and Mason Streets.

“A community with more streetlights is a safer, healthier and more-connected place for everyone,” said SFPUC General Manager Harlan L. Kelly, Jr. “We are proud to work alongside Mayor Breed and our public and private partners to bring new light and vitality to the Tenderloin.”

The design of the lights is intended to match the historic style poles along Taylor Street and Golden Gate Avenue. Additionally, by including two lights on each pole, one which lights the street and one which lights the sidewalk, these new improvements will enhance the pedestrian experience in the Tenderloin.

“As a not-for-profit organization, Sutter Health believes in giving back. Sutter Health’s CPMC recognizes that public safety and neighborhood investments are a key component of our community’s health,” said Hamila Kownacki, Chief Operating Officer of CPMC/Sutter Health. “We are proud to work with the City and County of San Francisco to fund enhanced lighting in the Tenderloin neighborhood so residents can feel safer at night. We look forward to joining this community as a neighbor when our Van Ness Campus opens in March of this year.”

“I began working with former Mayor Lee to increase the number of streetlights in the Tenderloin in 2011,” said Randy Shaw, Director of the Tenderloin Housing Clinic. “We are thrilled that this critical neighborhood safety project has finally been completed.”

“As a resident of the Tenderloin neighborhood, I find it of utmost importance to increase the lighting on our streets. I am a woman who works cleaning offices at night and appreciate this effort, and it that should be duplicated throughout the neighborhood since there are still many very dark streets and this makes it dangerous and a vulnerable place for residents. We hope this continues in 2019 and that all the Tenderloin is illuminated to improve neighborhood safety and comfort,” said Tenderloin resident Johana Ramirez.

“I’ve been here 24 years, since 1994. It has been dark. In my experience, when it’s bright, there’s no people doing drug activities. It makes a big difference,” said Alex Alhaj, owner Empire Market.

“I have lived in Tenderloin for more than 40 years. These new historic pedestrian lights are very attractive addition to our neighborhood and makes a huge difference in the night. I feel this is a good first step in returning our neighborhood to a place that we can be proud to be part of,” said Tenderloin resident Larry Gothberg.

###
Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I am writing to urge you to help us bring more reliable cell service to the Mission District and nearby neighborhoods by adding a cell site to 2990 24th Street.

Everyone uses broadband. Many of us depend on our mobile devices to take care of things at work or at home, every day. This type of service is especially important in San Francisco. We rely heavily on mobile technology more and more to do what we need to every day, and to stay connected for learning, health care, public safety, and so much more.

As a resident of San Francisco, I ask that you do what you can to bring better service to our area as quickly as possible, and support our efforts in the Mission District and across San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Eric Nicely
3783 20th St
San Francisco, CA 94110
Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I am writing to urge you to help us bring more reliable cell service to the Mission District and nearby neighborhoods by adding a cell site to 2990 24th Street.

Everyone uses broadband. Many of us depend on our mobile devices to take care of things at work or at home, every day. This type of service is especially important in San Francisco. We rely heavily on mobile technology more and more to do what we need to every day, and to stay connected for learning, health care, public safety, and so much more.

As a resident of San Francisco, I ask that you do what you can to bring better service to our area as quickly as possible, and support our efforts in the Mission District and across San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Kathy Langsam
650 Delancey St
San Francisco, CA 94107
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
www.sfplanning.org

From: Marie McNulty <mmcnulty@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2018 4:00 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: laurelheights2016@gmail
Subject: Case No. 2015-014028ENV; Project Title: 3333 California Street Mixed-Use Project Zoning

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

Please see my attached letter supporting the Neighborhood Full Preservation Alternative Plan, regarding the above referenced project.

Thank you.

Marie McNulty

3169 California Street, #2D

San Francisco, CA 94115
Dear Readers,

In response to the Chronicle editorial of regarding CASA of December 22, 2019, I am forwarding a proposal, described below, regarding paired housing. It in essence provides that a local agency (such as a city or county) must pair housing and office space in order to build more than a specified number of housing units (or a specified number of square feet of office space). The pairing may be across local boundaries so long as there is available public transportation between them with riding times of 15 minutes or less at frequencies during peak hours of ten minutes or less. There are exceptions for senior or 100% affordable housing and there must be a specified percentage of the housing units which are affordable.

While all may agree that housing is inadequate around the Bay Area, the public solutions such as CASA and SB 50 do NOT reflect the realities of how our growth has developed. Historically, before the tech boom, growth of office space occurred primarily in the three major hubs of San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose, with suburbs e.g. parts of Marin, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties contributing
housing for office workers working in the three major hubs. as did parts of the city of the workspace venue.

A significant break in that pattern started when Bank of America, Standard Oil and Fireman's Fund Insurance Company moved substantial numbers of employees to newly built campuses on cheap land in northern Marin County or Contra Costa County along the I-680 corridor. The rapidly developing “tech” industry, followed later along and around the 101 and I-280 corridors. What did not occur in the tech industry, particularly after the Great Recession to any significant degree, was the building of housing in the South Bay to house the employees of companies residing there. Much of that housing has been supplied by the three major cities, a clear reversal of the earlier historical patterns.

The municipal impetus for promoting the building of office space vs. housing is the "simplicity" of levying and collecting property taxes on larger parcels, a lesser need for infrastructure associated with residents, particularly families, and the belief that office/commercial space would produce greater net tax revenues. This caused housing prices in the South Bay to skyrocket.

Employees of South Bay companies, many of whom were quite well compensated, could only find "affordable" housing in three major hubs and, it is said, also enjoyed living in the big cities, so their employers accommodated them by providing caravans of huge buses plowing the freeways between the more /affordable/desirable major city "nesting" venues and the working venues and back, running up the housing costs in the major cities as well. This has placed an unfair burden on the major cities both in terms of infrastructure demands and limiting or eliminating housing for scores of middle income (or lower) local workers, to say nothing of the carbon emissions being released from vehicles plowing the freeways, many of which are huge buses or cars with few occupants.

Policy wise, at least in the Bay Area, one can no longer think of what are now small (er) communities as the “suburbs” if they want to promote any kind of growth. Their growth must be driven by both housing and work venues, not just one or the other. Neither SB 50 or CASA really addresses these issues, but rather reflect the desire of the "burbs" to continue as "burbs" with larger multifamily housing developments left to farther away communities with cheap(er) land the big cities to provide at ever-increasing costs, rents and prices. If SB 50 or CASA gets around to reflecting this proposal, there will be time enough to get into the "weeds" of those proposals, especially the financing proposals. But a good critique of CASA appears in the comments of Berkeley Mayor Jesse Arreguin published in the December 14, 2018 issue of the Berkeley Daily Planet.

Some will view this proposal as slowing growth, but that will occur only if a community which wants office growth doesn't provide housing as well or vice versa. If it can't provide the pairing of nesting and working venues, then it shouldn't be able to foist one or the other else where. In that regard, in executing a proposal such as this, there should first be a process employed to bring up to notional parity the housing and office space in a community, either of which has been developed in, say, the last five or so years.

My comments below about pairing were written before SB 50 was published or MTC had taken up CASA, but the issues regarding pairing have not changed substantively.

Thank you.

Paul Webber
A North Beach Resident

Proposal on Pairing Housing and Office Space

-----Original Message-----
From: pwebber928 <pwebber928@aol.com>
To: vallie.brown <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; malia.cohen <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; sandra.fewer
Ladies and Gentlemen,

You are soon to be hit with a tsunami of state bills relating to housing, most of which will have a common theme, and that will be to wrench local control of land use issues away from you and vest it in the state. The reason for this is the belief, correct or not, that you and other local agencies are not doing the job of providing affordable housing.

So rather than just objecting but offering no alternatives, the only way that may present a path forward is to (a) suggest the **INCLUSION OF LOCAL ALTERNATIVES** in key state bills such as the new SB 827, if they achieve the same end and (b) **PROVIDE SUCH AN ALTERNATIVE IN LOCAL LEGISLATION**.

More and more commentary has been published recently about the importance of building a balance of housing and office space within the same area so as to reduce distances traveled to work and reduce correlative housing costs. I have been working an idea to pair up housing and office space as a way to control the consequences of major office projects with inadequate local housing and the general recalcitrance of cities to build any paired new projects. If recent Bay Area development history is any example, it won’t work unless San Francisco locally mandates it. You may not like its complexity or its implications, but you will have very little say in the matter if you just do nothing. Is that what you want? As a voter and a "get out the voter", it's not what I nor what many other San Franciscans want. So here is one possibility. I offer it for your consideration and urgent development if we are to survive the coming state housing bill tsunami. Remember, the needed action is two fold; (a) get key state bills to include a provision for a local option; and (b) create the local option. So here is one option; you may think of others but have you so far?

1. In order to obtain authority to build more than some minimum number of residential units, perhaps 25, say, the developer would also have to pair it with office space in some ratio reflecting best practices. The residential space would have to have, say, 30 percent affordable (or more as augmented by density bonus laws), which couldn't be "feed out." The residential and office space could be located across local boundaries from each other so long as the distance between them was not greater than, say, 15 minutes by public transportation on lines running during peak hours at ten minute or more frequent intervals. The "secondary" office space could be existing space which, like in "cap and trade", could be purchased and would have to be up to some minimum standard, such as "first class office space". Similarly, the projects could be each be created by separate developers but must move forward to as a pair, and occupancy by one can't be lead/trail by XX% unless for the trailing project there are good funds are deposited in a escrow together a construction/rehab contract covering the balance of the trailing project with completion bonds. Finally, there should be included a "use it or lose it" provision of, say, three years.

2. The pairing requirement would not apply if the residential space were 100% "affordable/senior" housing. "Affordable" for all purposes would be intended to cover a range from "middle income" and below, measured in some fashion in the community in which the housing is to be located. (I know that isn't how it's done now but the current tests cover such broad and diverse geographic and income
spreads that many people in a target community are frozen out. Also, existing housing should be preserved OR tenants protected in a more comprehensive manner than was provided in this year's SB 827.

3. The local zoning laws would have to give way to some extent to accommodate the "secondary" projects if they otherwise could not meet the maximum public transportation distance. Also, seeking applicable local zoning rules (including spot zoning) for housing construction could trigger the pairing requirement.

The flip side of this would also apply where the primary project were new office space of some minimum amount and the housing could be purchased (or newly built) but otherwise need to meet the requirements of this proposal.

In all cases existing housing would be preserved OR replaced and tenants protected, but in a much more comprehensive manner than was done in SB 827.

4. This would somehow have to be integrated with or "trump" some of density bonus laws. They could be applied to the proposed housing, whether for primary or secondary and there is at least one such law applicable to office space paired with housing. It would also have to be somehow compatible with whatever the "Son of the SB 827" bill might looks like. (I can't say that I would support it as I haven't seen it. ; I opposed SB 827 for a variety of reasons, including that the affordable housing could be "feed out", the very limited protection of existing occupants and the triggering frequency of the public transportation to qualify for transit-centric housing was so low that only a bridle path in Golden Gate Park at night wouldn't have qualified.) The goal would be of course to amend that bill to include a local option and thus accommodate a qualifying local ordinance.

There are my thoughts. We certainly hope that you collectively consider doing something to retain local control of land use matters. If you don't like this idea then come up with your own but for goodness sakes do it quickly. Please remember two actions are required; get relevant state bills amended to include a local qualifying option AND create the local option.

Thank you.
Commissioners,
Attached are your Calendars for December 27, 2018 and January 3, 2019.

Again, congratulations on all your efforts this year!

Happy Holidays to you and yours,

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
www.sfplanning.org
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
www.sfplanning.org

From: Victor M. Marquez <victormarquezesq@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 12:19 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Whole Foods at Trinity Plaza Project

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

Jonas,

Please see attached letter.

Best,

Victor

Victor M. Marquez, Esq., Chair, ABA SOGI Commission
The Marquez Law Group
649 Mission Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, 94105
(415) 848-8971 office
(415) 314-7831 cell
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, December 20, 2018
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES DETAILED PROPOSAL TO FUND AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESSNESS, SHELTER, AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

Mayor Breed seeks to spend recently announced windfall on programs that address the City’s pressing issues

San Francisco, CA – Mayor London N. Breed today unveiled a detailed proposal to direct the $181 million in available funding from the City’s recently announced windfall to programs for homelessness, affordable housing, behavioral health, and street cleanliness.

The Mayor’s proposal would support the creation of over 900 new units of affordable housing, preserve and improve over 1,000 units of existing affordable housing, fund the expansion of 300 new spaces in homeless shelters and Navigation Centers, and open 86 behavioral health and substance abuse hospital beds.
“Opportunities like this are rare, which is why it is so important that we make responsible investments that will make an immediate impact in helping our homeless population into shelter, creating new affordable housing for our low-income residents, and keeping our streets clean,” said Mayor Breed. “The voters have been very clear that this is their top priority. The majority of the total windfall money is already being distributed to important programs like transportation and schools. I think we should take advantage of this chance to address the housing and homelessness crisis we see every day.”

Mayor Breed’s legislation, which is co-sponsored by Board of Supervisors President Malia Cohen, would direct $90.5 million for affordable housing programs to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development. This funding would provide $42 million to fund the construction of a homeless housing site and $14 million for the acquisition of one or more future 100% affordable housing sites. Approximately $20 million would fund the expansion of the Small Sites Program, which helps residents avoid displacement by removing properties from the speculative market and converting them to permanently affordable housing. The Sunnydale and Potrero public housing sites would receive $9 million in capital upgrades, and the remaining $6 million would fund the predevelopment of other affordable housing projects. All of the affordable housing investments are one-time expenses.

The legislation would direct the other $90.5 million to fund homelessness, behavioral health, and street cleanliness programs for a four-year time period. A total of approximately $56 million would be directed to temporary shelter and treatment programs:

- $11 million going to expand existing Navigation Centers by over 100 beds;
- $9 million going to open 14 additional beds at San Francisco Healing Center at St. Mary’s Hospital;
- $10 million to open 72 new substance use recovery beds; and
- $27 million to support 200 new beds in a Shelter Access For Everyone (SAFE) emergency homeless shelter, which will incorporate elements of San Francisco’s Navigation Center model in larger settings.

In addition to shelters, $30 million will be allocated to add approximately 300 units of permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless individuals. In order to further address street cleanliness, $4 million will be allocated to the expansion of high need neighborhood cleaning and the expansion of the Pit Stop Program, which provides staffed public restrooms. This funding will support programming and operations for four years, which is intended to serve as a bridge until more sustainable funding sources can be secured.

A total of approximately $234 million of the $415 million windfall will be allocated to specific programs and reserves. This includes $38 million for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, $35 million for San Francisco Unified School District, $19 million for children and family programming, $9 million for the Public Library, and $2 million for street tree maintenance.

There is no guarantee that the windfall being recognized will continue in future years, which is why Mayor Breed is prioritizing one-time expenses or programs that can serve as a bridge to more sustainable funding. Under state law, property taxes are distributed by the Controller to the City, school district, and other taxing entities within its borders, with a unique formula for each county. In 1992 and 1993, as a means of balancing the State budget, the State directed all
counties to create an Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) and shift local property tax revenue to the fund. In San Francisco, 25% of collections from base property tax rate is allocated to ERAF.

As the property tax roll has grown by 20% in the last two years, the revenue has increased funding for ERAF to a level that exceeds the City’s funding obligation, and as a result the excess property tax contributions will be returned to the City. The funding total is approximately $415 million for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-2019. Approximately $78 million of this funding must be allocated to various baselines and approximately $156 million must go to Rainy Day Reserves, leaving approximately $181 million available for other purposes.

“We are in the middle of a mental health and addiction crisis in our country, our city, and on our streets,” said Dr. Vitka Eisen, President of CEO of HealthRIGHT 360. “We must address this crisis by providing those most in need with the health services that they need and the housing options that they deserve. We must help get people off the street and into a healthier, more prosperous, and more fulfilling future. The investments proposed today make it clear that the Mayor understands the priorities of our residents, and I want to thank her for making such a promising investment in the health of our city.”

“We have the opportunity to make real and transformative investments with these resources in addressing our housing and homelessness crisis,” said Tomiquia Moss, Chief Executive Officer of Hamilton Families. “By prioritizing funding for affordable housing projects which serve formerly homeless individuals and families, expanding shelter options for those experiencing homelessness, and increasing behavioral health services Mayor Breed’s proposal will help us serve those most in need in our City.”

“San Francisco is in desperate need of more housing and specifically supportive housing for the most vulnerable members of our city, including seniors and people with disabilities,” said Gail Gillman, CEO of Community Housing Partnership. “Mayor Breed’s proposal would not only help those currently experiencing homelessness by opening up new beds in Navigation Centers and shelters, it would also create new opportunities for individuals ready to move into permanent housing as well.”

“San Francisco has a large affordable housing debt that has become a crisis,” said Jamestown Community Center Executive Director and Planning Commission Vice President Myrna Melgar. “We owe this debt to our working class families, our African American and Latino citizens who have been displaced, our seniors, our tenants, the homeless and above all we owe it to our children. When you get a one-time windfall and you owe, you don't go out and buy something new, or even use it for your regular expenses - you use it to pay your debt. Our debt as a City to the next generation will get a sizable payment because of Mayor Breed's investment for which I am grateful, as it is long overdue.”

“Every unit of housing is a solution to homelessness, and using these unexpected funds to support those amongst us who are most in need is the right thing to do,” said Beth Stokes, Executive Director of Episcopal Community Services. “Making significant investments in new housing units while also increasing our capacity to provide shelter for people while that housing is built, will go a long way in meeting our shared goal of ending chronic homelessness in San Francisco.”
“This funding will make a real difference in the lives of hundreds of families living in our neighborhoods,” added recent Fisk University graduate and Sunnydale resident Breonna Frierson. “For too long we have been cut off from safe and decent housing, and from real opportunity. This investment that Mayor Breed is willing to make into our neighborhoods finally allows Sunnydale and Potrero Hill to be a part of the rest of San Francisco. Thank you Mayor Breed for giving the community hope and for trying to invest in what often feels like the forgotten.”

###
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Thursday, December 20, 2018
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131
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There is no guarantee that the windfall being recognized will continue in future years, which is why Mayor Breed is prioritizing one-time expenses or programs that can serve as a bridge to more sustainable funding. Under state law, property taxes are distributed by the Controller to the City, school district, and other taxing entities within its borders, with a unique formula for each county. In 1992 and 1993, as a means of balancing the State budget, the State directed all
counties to create an Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) and shift local property tax revenue to the fund. In San Francisco, 25% of collections from base property tax rate is allocated to ERAF.

As the property tax roll has grown by 20% in the last two years, the revenue has increased funding for ERAF to a level that exceeds the City’s funding obligation, and as a result the excess property tax contributions will be returned to the City. The funding total is approximately $415 million for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-2019. Approximately $78 million of this funding must be allocated to various baselines and approximately $156 million must go to Rainy Day Reserves, leaving approximately $181 million available for other purposes.

“We are in the middle of a mental health and addiction crisis in our country, our city, and on our streets,” said Dr. Vitka Eisen, President of CEO of HealthRIGHT 360. “We must address this crisis by providing those most in need with the health services that they need and the housing options that they deserve. We must help get people off the street and into a healthier, more prosperous, and more fulfilling future. The investments proposed today make it clear that the Mayor understands the priorities of our residents, and I want to thank her for making such a promising investment in the health of our city.”

“We have the opportunity to make real and transformative investments with these resources in addressing our housing and homelessness crisis,” said Tomiquia Moss, Chief Executive Officer of Hamilton Families. “By prioritizing funding for affordable housing projects which serve formerly homeless individuals and families, expanding shelter options for those experiencing homelessness, and increasing behavioral health services Mayor Breed’s proposal will help us serve those most in need in our City.”

“San Francisco is in desperate need of more housing and specifically supportive housing for the most vulnerable members of our city, including seniors and people with disabilities,” said Gail Gillman, CEO of Community Housing Partnership. “Mayor Breed’s proposal would not only help those currently experiencing homelessness by opening up new beds in Navigation Centers and shelters, it would also create new opportunities for individuals ready to move into permanent housing as well.”

“San Francisco has a large affordable housing debt that has become a crisis,” said Jamestown Community Center Executive Director and Planning Commission Vice President Myrna Melgar. “We owe this debt to our working class families, our African American and Latino citizens who have been displaced, our seniors, our tenants, the homeless and above all we owe it to our children. When you get a one-time windfall and you owe, you don't go out and buy something new, or even use it for your regular expenses - you use it to pay your debt. Our debt as a City to the next generation will get a sizable payment because of Mayor Breed's investment for which I am grateful, as it is long overdue.”

“Every unit of housing is a solution to homelessness, and using these unexpected funds to support those amongst us who are most in need is the right thing to do,” said Beth Stokes, Executive Director of Episcopal Community Services. “Making significant investments in new housing units while also increasing our capacity to provide shelter for people while that housing is built, will go a long way in meeting our shared goal of ending chronic homelessness in San Francisco.”
“This funding will make a real difference in the lives of hundreds of families living in our neighborhoods,” added recent Fisk University graduate and Sunnydale resident Breonna Frierson. “For too long we have been cut off from safe and decent housing, and from real opportunity. This investment that Mayor Breed is willing to make into our neighborhoods finally allows Sunnydale and Potrero Hill to be a part of the rest of San Francisco. Thank you Mayor Breed for giving the community hope and for trying to invest in what often feels like the forgotten.”

###
December 12, 2018

City Of San Francisco – Planning Commission
Commission Chambers,
Room 400, City Hall,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: Case No. 2015-014028ENV
Project Title: 3333 California Street Mixed-Use Project Zoning: Residential, Mixed, Low Density [RM-1]
Zoning District 40-X Height and Bulk District Block/Lot: Block 1032/Lot 003
Applicant/Agent: Laurel Heights Partners LHP

Dear Planning Commissioners:

This letter is in follow-up to my letter dated December 4, 2018 which was submitted to the Commission via email prior to the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission meeting on December 5, 2018.

Last week, the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission expressed strong support for reviewing an alternative development plan that would not destroy the historic resource of the building by cutting it in half along with the removal of the surrounding landscaping including trees; referred to as the character of the defined feature of the site.

The Commissioners expressed their strong assessment of the interconnection between the building and the landscaping as the important resource and vital to the neighborhood. They believe that this project needs the neighborhood and the developer to come together to create a win-win for all parties as the only way it can be measured as a success. The Commission stated they wished they could have reviewed the Community Full Preservation Alternative Plan which was discussed but not available for review by the S.F. Historic Preservation Commission at the December 5th meeting. The Commissioners expressed their willingness to insure the integrity of the Historic elements are maintained and to get a second look at what will be the “final” alternative development plan supported by the community and the developer when sent back to them from the Planning Commission.

Also, the developer did not tell the community about the historic significance of the site. It was revealed during last week’s hearing by UCSF’s former architect that they were made aware of this back in 2010. The neighborhood learned that last year and had the building and landscaping listed on the California Register of Historical Places because they were designed to complement each other in an integrated composition. So, the landscaping is also a historical resource on this site and has been used for recreation by the public since built.

Under the community alternative, the main building would be converted into housing units rather than demolishing the smaller wing and cut through half of it. There would be, in addition to the residential units on California Street, a new Mayfair residential building. The existing cafe and childcare center would remain, and the existing pathway through the building that opens onto the Terrace and onto Masonic, would remain eliminating the need for additional public pass-through access to be constructed.
It should be noted that the DEIR Full Preservation Alternative C shows 26 fewer housing units than the Project and 44,306 square feet of retail, which we already thought was planned to be converted to housing to match the number of housing units in the proposed project.

The Community has already shown that it supports reasonable and sustainable levels of housing as seen with the CPMC project with 270 units, the Lucky Penny with 95 units. And, now, 3333 California with 558 units.

We urge you to extend the comment period on the Draft EIR in order to evaluate this Community Full Preservation Alternative Plan and compared it to the DEIR Full Preservation Alternative C with the same level of detail as the alternatives in the DEIR because it will be less impactful on the surrounding neighborhoods and will not destroy the historic resource of the building and the surrounding landscaping. The Community Full Preservation Alternative Plan will give the City of San Francisco the housing it desires for the site in 3-5 years and builds 4 new buildings versus 14 new buildings in 7 to 15 years as proposed by the developer.

The developer proposes to destroy the historically significant characteristics of the site and create nondescript buildings crowded onto the site. They look to changing the zoning to allow retail which was banned in Planning Commission Resolution 4109 to avoid adverse impacts to Laurel Village and Sacramento Street.

We feel that this site deserves respect and that any decision made on how it’s redeveloped is important enough to not rush but get right. With that in mind, I would hope that the historical cemetery plaque be returned to the site and a historical plaque with the designers and historical significance of the building and the landscaping be memorialized on the site as well since the building and landscaping are listed on the California Register of Historical Places.

Thank you in advance for your time and serious consideration of the Community Full Preservation Alternative Plan.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission to grant a 15-day extension of the Due Date for Comments on this DEIR. It is a lengthy and complex document.

Thank you.

Victoria Underwood
510 Presidio Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94115

Victoria.underwood@att.net

cc:
LaurelHeights2016@gmail.com
Dear Planning Commissioners:

This letter is in direct response to the Draft EIR, Volume2c: Appendices D-G, published November 7, 2018. I have read the report and I have a number of comments and concerns.

The Notice of Public Hearing was posted at the corners of the 3333 California location, but both pages failed to be posted providing informative and critical information to the public.

1. Your name and email contact address and phone number
2. The Planning Department’s website address in order to download the Draft EIR document assessment
3. The Notice of a Public Hearing before the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday December 5th at 12:30 p.m. at which the Historic Commission is to make its comments on the Draft EIR.
4. Notice to the Public that public comments to the Historic Preservations will be accepted from 11/8/2018 - 12/24/2018.

The Draft EIR states that the project would have a Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation impact on noise because it would "expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards or cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels." (page 4.D.36) "The estimated construction period is 7 to 15 years.

The Draft EIR states that the project would have a Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation impact on historic architectural resources because the project "would demolish portions of the office building... and remove all of the project site's existing designed landscape elements and features, including, but not limited to, the curvilinear shapes in pathways, driveways, and planting areas; integrated landscape features, including planter boxes and seating; brick perimeter walls; and the concrete pergola and terraced planting feature facing Laurel Street." (p. 4.B.41)

The DEIR admits that the project would be expected to generate higher Vehicle Miles Traveled than retail, office or residential average projects in the area. The DEIR compares the project with city average data but not with actually measured traffic conditions in the project area. However, the DEIR concludes that the project would have an impact on traffic that would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation. (page 4.C.74) "The DEIR claims that reducing the retail parking supply would mitigate the Vehicle Miles Traveled impacts of the project." (page 4.C.80)

The DEIR estimates that the project would generate 10,057 daily automobile trips (page 4.C.58). This is probably an understatement because another EIR for a mixed use project estimated 13,000 automobile trips generated by the retail square footage alone (approximately 54,000 square feet), and the proposed project also has 558 or 744 residential units and a 49,999 square foot new office building that would generate additional vehicle trips.

The EIR Intersection Operations Analysis (Page 9, Task 7.2) has focused on transit timing on California Street. To say that Applicant’s Proposed Project will have little or no impact on transit and traffic flow on all surrounding streets, simply is NOT true. As it is currently during the commute, Masonic Avenue is solid cars between Presidio and
Euclid during evening commute hours and that is with the right most lane on Presidio with the additional lane to Euclid; both of which are to be removed as part of Applicant’s Proposed Project. As it is currently, for every southbound vehicle that stops on Presidio at the Presidio/Pine/Masonic light, three now utilize the right most lane up to Masonic or Euclid. That means that if 3 to 5 cars stop for the traffic light, 9 have driven up Masonic and no are longer sitting waiting to turn right at the light. But, if you eliminate that right most lane, those cars will have to wait for the light to change and back up to the SFFD Credit Union Building at Presidio and California. Additionally, Muni buses have a shift change and buses are coming off California onto Presidio Avenue; add one or two buses and traffic on Presidio will back up to California. The impact for anyone familiar with these intersections is clear. I just have to look out the window. The idea that you can add three total ingress/egress active driveways on Presidio next to the SFFD Credit Union ingress/egress garage driveway and then do the same on Masonic and, not overload all the surrounding streets as the Applicant’s Proposed Project does by using criteria from other sites without understanding these major thoroughfares, will be disastrous. You could end up backing traffic all the way down to the financial district.

The DEIR claims that project impacts on air quality, geology, hydrology, vegetation and other matters would be less than significant.

During the 15-year construction period the developer is requesting, the developer would be able to apply for changes to make the project bigger, expand the retail and increase the heights and amounts of development. This suggests further entitlements and profiting from real estate speculation on the back of the neighborhoods affected by the proposed Project. The Applicant is trying to make us all believe that their proposed project is for the better good and will address the more immediate issue the City has for additional and affordable housing. It is ludicrous that it would take 15 years of construction to accomplish that. It is clear that anyone who supports the Proposed Project and the proposed construction schedule does not live within the immediate proximity of this site.

I, along with many of my neighbors, have opposed the developer's concept from the beginning. We are in of the need for additional and affordable housing in our neighborhood. We stand against the Applicant’s proposed project because it would be destructive to the neighborhood. The developer’s proposal is too massive, too commercialized and out of character with the neighborhood and, since we know now about the Historic Preservation Commission’s assessment about the value of the existing historic building and landscaping, we continue to wonder how the Applicant has been able to push a plan that would do so much damage to the site and the neighborhood so far down the road.

We have objected to the destruction and removal of the existing green areas. We’ve asked the Applicant of the Proposed Project for an alternative preservation plan that is consistent with the design and aesthetics of the condominiums directly across the street from the Project on California Street between Laurel and Walnut (for example) without touching any of the green and landscaped areas on Masonic, Euclid or Laurel. The neighborhood has expressed its desire to have the Applicant redesign the proposed Project so preserve as much of the site as possible and complete critically needed residential housing in the shortest time possible. We’ve written letters to the Applicant, addressed these issues in person with the Applicant at the Developer’s poster-board sessions and at the Scoping Meeting at the JCC with the Planning Department but we have yet to see a design that warrants serious consideration by the neighborhood or the City.

I believe the Project, as proposed, will have an enormously, negative impact on the neighborhood and surrounding areas. The proposed uses and high density of the proposed project will increase traffic flow and congestion, increase noise and pollution and increase the loss of parking, etc. The proposed removal of the green spaces and mature trees and plants will unnecessarily impact the local environment and deprive the surrounding area from continued public use.

The increased noise from the Proposed Project, including construction activities, will adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors including existing residential housing units surrounding the 10-acre site, the elderly residential facility at the JCC across the street from the site and child care uses at the JCC. There is no reason or justification for relocating the Child Care Center from its current location on the existing site. We know that the existing zoning limits heights greater than 40 feet at Euclid and Masonic and no retail is permitted.

To m
A Community Alternative Plan (hereinafter referred to as “CAP”) is being created to reflect what we believe will preserve the entire Historical Building. The design will include re-purposing of the Historical Building to residential use. The “CAP” will preserve Eckbo Terrace, Children’s Childcare Playground, along with the Redwood trees, and preserve all Historic Landscaping. The existing green spaces on Laurel, Euclid, Masonic and Presidio will remain intact in this redesign. The “CAP” will accomplish the Applicant’s goal of providing 558-744 housing units (Variant) by a design of three or four, four-story buildings on the existing surface parking lots facing California Street; with no retail or office. As we understand it, the housing units facing California Street in the CAP will be consistent with the design and aesthetics of the condominiums directly across the street as mentioned above. The number of trees and landscaping to be removed will be substantially less in the CAP Plan. We have not seen the fully-designed CAP but we wholeheartedly support the draft of a plan that we have seen because it is less destructive and can be completed and online satisfying the immediate need for additional housing within the timeline of three to five years; not 15 years.

Applicant’s Proposed Plan does not serve any of us well. They have had every opportunity to redesign and submit an Alternative Preservation Plan and they have refused to do that. My sincerely hope is the Planning Department will want to consider the CAP which is timely and less impactful to the neighbors and the many neighborhoods and stop the negative impact that will undoubtedly occur by approval of the Applicant’s Proposed Plan before this goes any farther.

Thank you.

Victoria Underwood
510 Presidio Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94115

Victoria.underwood@att.net

cc:
LaurelHeights2016@gmail.com
January 4, 2019

City Of San Francisco – Planning Commission
Commission Chambers,
Room 400, City Hall,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Commissions secretary@sfgov.org
richhillissf@gmail.com
Myrna.melgar@sfgov.org
planning@rodneyfong.com
Millicent.johnson@sfgov.org
Katherin.moore@sfgov.org
Dennis.richards@sfgov.org

Re: Case No. 2015-014028ENV
Project Title: 3333 California Street Mixed-Use Project Zoning: Residential, Mixed, Low Density [RM-1]
Zoning District 40-X Height and Bulk District Block/Lot: Block 1032/Lot 003
Applicant/Agent: Laurel Heights Partners LHP

Dear Planning Commissioners:

This letter is in follow-up to my letters dated December 4, 2018 and December 12, 2018. Since I never received a confirmation receipt back from your email system that you even received them, I am including them again along with this transmittal letter (via hard copy).

I attended the Planning Commission Meeting on December 13, 2018 where DEIR comments were heard by the Commission relative to the redevelopment plans for 3333 California Street. After hearing some of the statements made by all, I offer these additional comments.

Thank you for voting for the fifteen-day extension so our plan could be submitted to you for review. Most of us are lay people and there are no classes to help us get through the on-slot of information contained in the report or to help us with understanding the full impact of what is being presented; much less its accuracy. By granting the extension, many of my neighbors who traveled to see their families during this national break have had the welcomed additional time needed to get through the DEIR materials.

We have been working hard, donating our time and money over the last four or five years because we believe what will eventually get built on the site is extremely important for our Community; not only for the future but for those of us living here now.

The Community has been portrayed as opposing additional housing but that has not been the case. The community has supported the CPMC project with 270 residential units, the Lucky Penny site with 95 units, and now 3333 California Street with 558 units. There are also additional housing units getting built in the neighborhood, but they don’t get the attention these locations get because of the number of housing units are much smaller but all need to be counted and recognized for their impact on the community at large. Over 1,000 residential units in a half mile radius is a lot of development.
I know for myself, I want to see a common-sense approach to building as we look to the future. Why destroy, remove or create hazardous conditions when you don’t need to. With that in mind, “The Community Full Presentation Residential Alternative” for 3333 California Street as it is now called, would do the following:

a) Preserve the Historic characteristics of the building and landscaping.
b) It would limit construction to the California Street side of the property and to Mayfair
c) It will match the surrounding architectural design in character and style consistent with those residential condominiums directly across the street on California.
d) It will allow for the retention of far more of the mature trees and landscaping
e) It will provide for 558 (or 744 in the Variant) housing units without rezoning and revoking Resolution 4109, the agreement that runs with the site between the City and the surrounding neighbors.
f) It builds the housing units in three years
g) It will keep the impact of construction on the community and environmental risks to a minimum.
h) It will preserve the present childcare center and play area and the community’s access to the existing green areas bordering the site on four sides.
i) It will protect the small, family-owned businesses in Laurel Village, Sacramento Street, Presidio Avenue which are the very fabric of the neighborhood. They are already under immense pressure.

What it won’t do:

j) It won’t bring excessive, unnecessary, and unwanted traffic and congestion, noise, pollution to the neighborhoods this site touches by turning it into a mini-city and destination
k) It won’t bring unneeded retail/office/commercial spaces as the developer has insisted upon
l) It won’t add unneeded height to a building when we already have six floors to look at on Presidio Avenue.
m) It won’t take 15 years to build and decimate the community and surrounding streets.
n) It won’t be an opportunity to sell a new entitlement on an up-zoned property.

I live on the southeast corner of Presidio Avenue at California Street which provides me with views from Presidio Avenue and California south to Pine and Masonic Avenue up towards Euclid as well as up California towards Walnut. The traffic in these two intersections on any given day much less any commute is overwhelming NOW. Add tech shuttle buses, express buses on California and Pine and a Fire Department Emergency Response calls from Fire Station 10 and it’s over the top.

What the developer has proposed for these two intersections is beyond all comprehension. I was glad when one of your colleague Commissioner, Kathrin Moore, described the run up Pine and on Masonic similar to driving on the freeway and that’s NOW. Finally, a reality check from someone other than a resident who lives here who experiences it every day. And, as I’ve stated now in at least five letters, adding ingress and egress driveways, deletion of the right most lane on to Masonic from Presidio and adding loading zones and driveways on Masonic and Euclid, a crosswalk on Presidio Avenue and bicycles and you have not only a huge traffic mess but an impasse zone and parking lot and a dangerous mess. None of this was addressed in the DEIR.

The traffic noise along with blasting music and honking is unbelievably loud now. As I’ve mentioned in my prior letter addressing the DEIR, I have addressed the issue of the traffic and what affect the developer’s project would do to not only the surrounding streets but our entire neighborhood as traffic unloads on to other side streets in order to alleviate their frustration. The westbound traffic on California between Presidio Avenue and Walnut can be a nightmare as cars line up on Walnut Street, around the
corner and east on the California and from there all the way down to Presidio Avenue. An example of poor design approval and its effect on daily traffic.

The DEIR doesn’t reflect the potential conditions that would result if the developer’s plan is approved. I leave the auto counts, greenhouse gas measurements, pollution counts and other technical facts and calculations to the consultants from donations we’ve made to help us through this.

There are so many downsides to the developer’s proposals and I now choose light and positive energy instead. None of the “issues” are issues under our Community Full Preservation Plan. Whether it be too many ingress-egress driveways cutting into traffic on Masonic, Euclid, Presidio Avenue, eliminating the right most lane at Presidio Avenue, introduction of retail on city blocks with almost no pedestrians because it’s basically a freeway, the loss of parking and the addition of loading zones that people and mini-buses will have to back into on this “freeway” maze. The tremendous loss of quality of our lives at the advancement of noise, pollution, environment impact, loss of green spaces and trees. All of it, unnecessary and hardly a positive step forward.

When considering the future, please don’t forget the neighborhoods that currently thrive and exist around this site. Repurposing isn’t a bad thing when the impact is less overall. Everyone says we need more housing and that they think it’s a great idea. But when I say back to them, “So you wouldn’t mind 558-744 housing units being built across the street from where you live over the course of 15 years?” The reply is always the same, “Oh, no I wouldn’t like that at all!” We are trying to find something that works and doesn’t burden the people who already live in direct proximity and work in nearby small businesses. What is really happening when you drill down past the minutia is taking a single-user site and repurposing it to accept multi-users. Nothing in that description implies destruction. We believe our plan accomplishes that and it has Community support.

The Commission is faced with making a decision on whether to go with the “Community Full Preservation Plan” or to go with some version of the developer’s “Destructive Plan”. We think our plan makes the most sense for all the right reasons. We believe that our plan can be approved without further studies and delays in construction to bring the needed housing on line.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration of our Community Full Preservation Plan.

Victoria Underwood
510 Presidio Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94115

Victoria.underwood@att.net

cc:
LaurelHeights2016@gmail.com
kei.zushi@sfgov.org
Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org
Re: 2018-006212CUA

For Planning Commission Meeting scheduled January 17, 2018:
Proposed project at 145 Laurel Street, San Francisco, CA 94118

To whom it may concern, I am unavailable to attend the scheduled meeting. However, I would greatly appreciate if my public writing comments (see attached) are conveyed to the members of the Planning Commission.

Thank you much

Jon
Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for taking the time to consider alternative designs for the proposed project at 145 Laurel Street, 2018-006212CUA. I have been an AT&T wireless subscriber, and I understand the importance of improving indoor signals.

However, I have concerns whether the proposed project follows WTS guidelines. For example, in San Francisco’s Wireless Planning Advisory Bulletin #3, under Height Limits on page 13, it states “in height districts of 65 feet or less: 1) faux vent pipes and screen walls (e.g. faux mechanical elevator or stairwell penthouses) may rise 10 feet above the specific height district”. It also states that “There are no variances available to exceed height limits”. Given the existing building’s height is 67 feet and 4 inches, any proposed enclosures placed on the roof in a 40-X, RH1 district would rise above the 40 feet height limit plus 10 feet addition.

If the proposed project is determined to eligible for a Conditional Use Authorization despite the above restrictions, I humbly ask that the Planning Commission consider a design that is less bulky and would follow the spirit of the above height limits. As you know, the site of the proposed project is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The building’s towers the neighborhood at 67 feet and 4 inches; it can even be seen from Grandview Park. While the proposed project does not extend beyond the building’s current penthouse height, the building has a very large footprint in a neighborhood consisting mostly of smaller houses. The addition of four large enclosures, each up to 10 feet tall above the visible roof line seen from the street, would add to that footprint. If one were to transpose those enclosures onto a neighboring house, one would be effectively adding a one-story tall extension to a residence for the purposes of housing WTS antennas.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns,

Jon