Please see attached

Aaron Starr, MA  
Manager of Legislative Affairs  
Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6362 Fax: 415-558-6409  
Email: aaron.starr@sfgov.org  
Web: www.sfplanning.org
Hi Emma,

Thank you for getting back to me on this.

I know the Mayor means well in her support of ADU’s, but the hastily and carelessly written
legislation originated by then supervisor Scott Wiener has spawned a dark side of abuse by wealthy (GREEDY) corporate developers which has made my life (and thousands of others) a living hell for over a year now. Ironically and sadly the law is now hurting more people in San Francisco than it is helping.

Developers are buying up apartment buildings with the sole purpose of taking away parking, driving out rent controlled tenants, adding one or two units and flipping them for a profit and with a total disregard for the housing crisis (they leave many units un-rented in pursuit of their quick buck). They have total contempt for existing residents here in The City and some have taken their pursuit of profits to hideous extremes. One such person is the developer Joe Peters:

...who has been harassing me for over a year now because I am opposed to his ADU that will terribly disrupt the life of this senior citizen with disabilities and many others like me in our building of 30 residents. Something is very wrong when this piece of legislation has driven a developer to harass me late at night while I was sound asleep five days before a Christmas Holiday, forcing me to call the police in terror and have him escorted off the property. Also, he deliberately tore out our garage burglar alarm with full knowledge that this had kept us crime free since it was installed. I begged and pleaded with him not to, but he did it specifically to inflict maximum emotional distress and sure enough just days after the burglar alarm was dismantled we had a rash of garage burglaries and package thefts, the first in years. I have no doubt that he did this to try and drive me and other rent controlled tenants out of the building. My next-door neighbors, a very nice Indian family have already left and he has repeatedly threatened to try and evict me. This is some of the unforeseen madness that the ADU has instigated, one incident of many that I have suffered. They are documented in detail in the email below. Is this abuse of a senior citizen with disabilities elder abuse? Someone should investigate.

This developer must be brought to justice and his ADU planning application rejected by the Planning Commission when he submits it. I am one example of the problems the ADU has created, but there are thousands of others here in The City that are suffering in silence, you need only contact the many Tenants Rights Organizations to hear the horror stories. I beg and pray that the Mayor will pay attention to this and work with the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to revise the ADU legislation so that tenant’s quality of life is protected and developers are re-focused on a less piecemeal (horribly inefficient) approach to solve the housing crisis. Please read my email below for significantly more detail on how this can be accomplished.

Sincerely,

Roger Dawson
On 1/2/2020 10:32 AM, Heiken, Emma (MYR) wrote:

Hello Roger,

Thank you for contacting with Office of Mayor London N. Breed. I have forwarded your concern to the Mayor’s advisor on Housing for his consideration.

Best,

Emma Heiken

Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City & County of San Francisco
Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and Mayor Breed,

For the better part of this year I have been pleading with all of you to do something about the abuse of the ADU. Early this morning I was woken up by the choking vapors of carbon monoxide and the noises of machinery, drilling and breaking of concrete. As I sit in my living room trying to write this, the noise is unbearable and I can barely think or breathe. There was no notice given, there were no building permits or planning applications filed and when I went down to talk to the crew they said they were hired by the owner/architects to drill and take soil samples for fear that the steeply inclined hill upon which this building rests might give way if an ADU were built here.

Someone needs to investigate why such destructive testing with the tearing up of concrete and the boring of large holes is being done with no permits or applications filed.

Even more alarming, is the fact that this building sitting on such a steep hill will surely suffer some catastrophe in the event of an earthquake or flooding if it’s loading is modified with ADU’s. Obviously now after my repeated warnings to them, the owners and their contractors have become paranoid to the point where they have initiated destructive testing. This building is too sensitive and should just not be disturbed. The City must not allow their greedy ADU plans to be approved, the impact on us residents from both the construction and the subsequent danger of our home sliding down the hill onto Market Street are too much.

This activity is so horrific and destructive that I recorded it on video so that you may see for yourself how terrible it is. With every deep breath I take, I am coughing from the generator’s carbon monoxide, my eyes are red and irritated from concrete dust which is permeating the building and my ears are ringing from the noise of the jackhammer... louder than anything I’ve ever heard before in my life because of the amplification in the garage. Right now I am a nervous wreck. Imagine trying to live with this for two years of ADU construction. I can’t, and it would surely be the death of me as well as causing damages to my 30 fellow residents.

Here is the video documentation I made today and uploaded to YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkdWkUMuHmM&feature=youtu.be
The Board of Supervisors needs to implement immediate measures reforming this defective legislation, and concurrently give the Planning Commission the authority to reject ADU applications that negatively impact existing tenants.

Why are we continuing to allow greedy cold-blooded developers to weaponize the ADU and attack our low income rent controlled Senior Citizens?

With an attitude of "we are far superior to the people we rent to", greedy Landlord Supremacists are abusing renters, treating them like cattle in a pen and arrogantly destroying the harmony of our city. I have never seen behavior this abhorrent in my 60+ years of living here. Landlords here in San Francisco have a virtual monopoly (via collusion) on the housing market and they relish and abuse the power it gives them. When did it become OK to allow landlords to disrespect renters so blatantly? Rumors abound about developers using their wealth to influence peddle here in our City. Honestly, if we were living at the zoo we'd be better protected and such abuse and harassment would result in arrests. Even one of the Planning Commissioners, at a meeting I attended in March, expressed her anxiety at being a renter here in SF and living with the threat of eviction, another expressed relief that he was able to buy a house.

Three actions should immediately be implemented to restore San Francisco to a peaceful, respectful place for renters to live.

1. Give the Planning Commission the necessary and immediate authority that they can consider the well-being of tenants as the most important factor in approving or disapproving ADU projects here in the city.

2. Add protections to the ADU for current residents of rent controlled buildings:
   
   *No amenities relied upon by existing residents shall be infringed for the purpose of adding additional units to include: access, parking, laundry and storage. Additional units shall be properly insulated for sound to minimize disturbing adjacent units. Construction of additional units shall respect the current residents and not disrupt their access, parking or other amenities. Residents shall be protected from the noise, vibration and dust of demolition & construction. Construction shall be completed within a reasonable length of time.*
3. Put a stop to Landlord Supremacist’s abuse of renters by instituting a $250,000 fine for any landlord caught harassing tenants, not responding to their needs in a timely manner or otherwise negatively affecting the quality of their life at their residence. We need to change their attitude from one of arrogance to one of walking on eggshells in consideration of their tenant’s well being.

A law like #3 would change the landscape to one of landlords who truly care about their tenants. All three actions would give thousands peace of mind and tranquility at home here in The City.

I was one of the first whistle-blowers (a year ago) to bring ADU abuse to the attention of the Supervisors and later the Planning Commission at a hearing on 3/14/19.

As a senior citizen with disabilities and on a fixed income, my rent controlled apartment at 801 Corbett Ave. on Twin Peaks has been my home and my sanctuary for 12 years.

It allows me to live my life in quiet peace, manage my pain and maintain my mobility and independence. If an ADU were allowed in the garage, not only would it take away access to my car so badly needed for my health issues, but the construction noise will be intolerable for me and my fellow residents who live directly on top of the garage. This building has very thin floors and the concrete garage is an echo chamber that will be excruciating if there is continuous construction for two years. I would not be able to tolerate 2 years of extreme noise/shock/vibration. It would surely be my death sentence as the stress would give me a heart attack. Noise is a health factor which is just as deadly as pollution, carcinogens and cholesterol.

Because of this and my efforts to prevent the disruption of the lives at my building, I have faced constant retaliation by new owner/speculator Mark Hyatt (aka: MEH Pioneer, LLC) and Joe Peters his ADU developer.
Wealthy Newport Beach (registered Republican) Mark E. Hyatt (aka MEH Pioneer, LLC) is extremely secretive and there are no images of him anywhere. However, his wife "Honeybee" (yes, her real name) loves flaunting their wealth (and CO2 emissions) for the news in Orange County. Mr. Hyatt has never returned any of the dozens of calls made and emails I have sent to him regarding harassment by his developer Joe Peters, neglected building maintenance issues, or even flooding emergencies. Not even a response regarding a large water damage hole in the fire sprinkler section of our garage ceiling that hasn't been repaired in over 10 months now.

This is very alarming to us all since Mark Hyatt's other building in Redwood City turned into a tragic inferno:

The San Mateo County Times - 2013
The six-alarm fire in the 72-unit Hallmark House Apartments at 531 Woodside Road displaced 97 residents and killed one tenant — 48-year-old Darin Michael Demello-Pine. About 20 people, including three firefighters, were injured as a result of the fire, first reported around 2 a.m. on July 7. A lawsuit, filed in San Mateo County Superior Court on behalf of Jorge and Juanita Chavez, states that Hallmark House residents “suffered displacement, fear, emotional trauma, and the loss of most of their life’s possessions” because of the fire. The building’s owner, KDF Hallmark LP, is to blame for the way the fire spread, according to the lawsuit, because it failed to “properly inspect, maintain and safeguard the property from a foreseeable unit fire.” KDF founder Mark Hyatt said in a phone interview that he can’t comment on the pending legal action.

Because of my outspoken opposition to the ADU plans that they have here, I have been the victim of an ever increasing amount of harassment by Joe Peters, the developer hired by Mark Hyatt. Joe Peters moved here from NY and has now made it his full time activity to exploit the ADU law for the quick enrichment of out of town speculators. Developer Joe Peters is the worst human being I've ever encountered in my entire life. I have been the victim of an ongoing campaign of abuse that has left me (a senior citizen with disabilities) terrified and a nervous wreck.

- He has followed me with a camera taking pictures of me and then sends me printouts letting me know he is "watching" me. Intentionally inflicting emotional distress upon me.

- He has come to the building late at night knocking on my door, waking me up and taunting me. I
have had to call the police to escort him off the property. An intentional infliction of emotional
distress upon me.

• In collusion with the owner Mark Hyatt they have conspired to isolate me by having the
organization not respond to my requests. When I confronted him about this he just looked at me with
a sickly smile and (almost proudly) acknowledged that no one is going to talk or respond to me. My
requests go unanswered and the building continues to deteriorate. Again, intentionally inflicting
emotional distress upon me.

• Despite my emotional pleading with him, he deliberately removed the security system protecting
our cars in the garage. It had been keeping us safe for years preventing burglaries and even helping
the police catch vicious gang suspects that were doing crime all over the city. As soon as he tore it
down we had a rash of burglaries in the garage and no more protection for our vehicles. Again,
intentionally inflicting emotional distress upon me and the other tenants.

• He has repeatedly threatened me with eviction in an arrogant and abusive manner. He takes every
opportunity to remind me of the eviction power he has because of his employment by the owner.
Again, intentionally inflicting emotional distress upon me.

I believe he is doing all this because he perceives me as being old and perhaps easily intimidated. He
is attacking those of us who are most vulnerable. **Is this Elder Abuse? Someone needs to
investigate this.**

As I get ready to mail my $1900 rent, it sickens me that my own money is being used against me, to
pay Joe Peters to harass me, maybe to make donations to Trump and to put gas into Mr. Hyatt's
enormous, hideous, CO2 belching Cadillac Escalade.

I believe these people have but one priority: to stuff the building's garage with an extra unit or two
and then flip it for what they hope will be a big profit. I don't think they give a rat's a$$ about the
housing situation here in Our City because I have never seen the building with so many vacant units
since they took over. That is the problem that the ADU has created and it must be addressed and
these people must be stopped before their actions further erode my health and well being as well as
negatively affecting the 30 other tenants who live here.

Something must be done by those of you on the Board of Supervisors and at the Planning
Commission so that when this Joe Peters files for an ADU permit representing MEH Pioneer, LLC
(aka Mark E. Hyatt) it can be rejected for its substantial negative impact on those of us who call 801
Corbett Ave. home.

Sincerely,

Roger Dawson
801 Corbett, # 15
San Francisco, CA 94131

Cell: (650) 218-5431
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, January 9, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS CELEBRATE GROUNDBREAKING OF AFFORDABLE SENIOR HOUSING IN THE MISSION

Casa de la Misión is the sixth new affordable housing development to break ground in the Mission District in the last 18 months

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed, Supervisor Hillary Ronen and community leaders today celebrated the groundbreaking of Casa de la Misión at 3001 24th Street. Once complete, the new building will provide 44 permanent supportive housing units for formerly homeless seniors.

“We need more housing of all types in San Francisco, especially for our most vulnerable residents,” said Mayor Breed. “I’m committed to creating more housing in San Francisco so that our seniors can exit homelessness and find a permanent home. With funding from our Affordable Housing Bond, which voters approved in November, we’ll be able to open even more senior housing like Casa de la Misión throughout the City.”
The existing building at 3001 24th Street will be demolished and replaced with four stories of senior housing. The housing will be located over two commercial spaces along 24th Street. MNC’s Mission Girls Youth Program was located in the existing building, but has since relocated their program to another site in advance of construction. MNC proposes to launch a hospitality workforce development program for marginalized young adults in the ground floor retail spaces.

“I can’t think of a better way to kick off the new year than by breaking ground on affordable housing in the heart of the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District!” said District 9 Supervisor, Hillary Ronen. “I applaud Mission Neighborhood Centers for recognizing that seniors are struggling to stay in this community, for responding in such a concrete way by building housing on this property they’ve owned for many years, and for their persistence in making this long-planned dream come true.”

“The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development is incredibly excited to celebrate the ground-breaking of the sixth MOHCD-supported affordable housing development in the Mission in less than two years, and want to congratulate MNC and Mercy Housing on their incredible work bringing the project to this milestone,” said Dan Adams, Acting Director of MOHCD. “In 2020, we look forward to continuing to build, renovate, and preserve high-quality affordable housing in the Mission and throughout San Francisco.”

Mercy Housing California and Mission Neighborhood Centers are partnering on this development and have enlisted HKIT architects and YA studios to bring their vision to life.

“Mercy Housing California is honored to be working with all of our project partners to develop vitally needed new affordable rental housing in San Francisco and the Mission District which, in a little over one year’s time from now, will be home to formerly homeless seniors 62 years of age and older,” said Doug Shoemaker, President of Mercy Housing California. “We are especially grateful for the significant and generous commitment from the Bettye Poetz Ferguson Foundation, which is providing $5 million of the project’s $30 million total project cost.”

Once built, la Casa de la Misión will feature a resident lobby, management offices, a meeting room, and community room, all located on the ground floor for resident use. The remaining ground floor area is dedicated to a landscaped courtyard. The fifth floor will feature an outdoor roof terrace as well as a resident laundry room.

“Senior citizens in our community—the Mission—have been disproportionately affected by high-levels of displacement over the last few decades. True to our settlement house roots, MNC continues to remain responsive to the needs of the communities we serve. MNC’s vision of community empowerment and commitment to the preservation of community values, at risk due to rampant gentrification, has compelled us to practice self-determination and invest wisely in areas of need,” said Sam Ruiz, CEO of Mission Neighborhood Centers. “This practice has enabled us to fight displacement and continue to serve the most vulnerable in our communities. At this critical time, we are overjoyed to be part of the solution. Casa de la Misión is a long-awaited vision, coming to fruition thanks to the hard work of our staff and committed community partners. It has been two decades in the making and it has been my honor to have led this process.”

All residential units will be supported through a City-funded Local Operating Subsidy
Program (LOSP) contract, and homeless applicants will be referred to the site through the City’s Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing’s Coordinated Entry System.

Erick Arguello, Founder and President of Calle 24 Latino Cultural District expressed, “we are very pleased this 100 percent affordable housing for seniors is breaking ground in the heart of the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District. It’s been a long time coming and is very much needed.”

Casa de la Misión has an expected move-in date of mid-2021.

The 2019 $600 million Affordable Housing Bond included $150 million for the creation of new affordable senior housing rental opportunities, through new construction and acquisition, and will fund projects like this one. There are a number of affordable housing developments for seniors planned throughout San Francisco.

###
From: Harper Lindstrom <harperlindstrom@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2020 10:49 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of support Dispensary Fig Location

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

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguye and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguye and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,

Signature

[Signature]

Date

11/9/20

Printed Name: HARPER LINDSTROM
Address: 1673 18th Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94112
Email: harperlindstrom@gmail.com
Dear SF Planning Commissioners,

As a SF business of landscape architecture and urban design, a resident, and climate advocate I am writing in support of the San Francisco Sustainable Neighborhood Framework. This is a much needed coordinated call for action across multiple efforts, agencies, and issues related to the climate crisis.

As San Franciscans, we pride ourselves with being environmental leaders and this holistic approach is necessary to rise to the challenges we face in our community and planet. It is important that we have ONE comprehensive strategy and response to the climate crisis – not separating out issues such as flooding, emissions or equity from each other. These are all interconnected which require a coordinated approach and by bringing them together our positive impacts will increase. By making it easy and consistent for built environment projects to support our collective climate and resilience goals we look forward to implementing solutions in a more effective and efficient way through streamlined navigation of agency reviews and approvals.

Thank you Lisa Fisher for your efforts and those that have guided this initiative to date. I look
forward to reviewing further developments of this program and learning more about how I can contribute.

Sincerely,
Pamela Conrad
CMG Landscape Architecture Principal, SF Waterfront Resilience Program Urban Design Team, Founder of Climate Positive Design

..
Dear Ms. Cushing and Department of Public Health,

Attached please find correspondence written on behalf of The Hollow Revolution ("THoR"), an association of neighbors living near 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California, concerning the proposal to grant "closure" status to the contaminated site located at 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California. Please note hard copies will follow by overnight mail. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Regards,

Toyer Grear
Office Manager / Paralegal
Lozeau Drury, LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
email: toyer@lozeaudrury.com
phone: 510-836-4200 / fax: 510-836-4205
Dear Commissioners,

When it comes to proposing projects, Sponsors have often struggled with how to best address the City’s sustainability goals and policies. The Planning Department’s Sustainable City Framework and Roadmap provides the needed guidance to effectively advance these goals through project development.

I wholeheartedly support the endeavor and look forward to your discussion tomorrow and action in upcoming meetings.

Thank you,
Kate McGee

KM Planning Strategy
415.298.5219

http://www.kmplanningstrategy.com
January 8

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Last year the Commission voted to eliminate parking on site as a code requirement. Buildings—especially ones in the heart of a dense transportation hub—do not need it because there are ample alternative options, including available existing parking, ample transit and viable active transportation modes.

The proposed building for Parcel F should support and sustain the car-free section of Natoma by actively promoting transit and other active transportation modes, outsourcing any parking needs, and activating people-oriented uses along Natoma. For the Chase Center, the Warriors have made this approach a pinnacle of pride in their development; the building on Parcel F should likewise take up this banner. It should NOT compromise this gem of a pedestrian space with loading and parking.

As wonderful as the park above the transit center is, its this pedestrian zone I make a point to use
every time I pass by or visit the transit center. It is a particular gem that gives breathing room to enjoy the lacy canopy that hovers above, and a unique vantage point to enjoy certain view corridors and adjacent architectural elements.

I had been under the impression that this pedestrian space was a core element of the vision for the transit center. Please keep it that way.

Respectfully,
Alice Rogers
Former TJPA CAC member, area resident

 Alice Rogers  
10 South Park St  
Studio 2  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
415.543.6554
Hello Planning Commissioners,

My name is Lara Caimi and I am a neighbor who lives two doors down from 1099 Dolores St, at 1083 Dolores. I’m writing to oppose the the proposed project (project app 2019-012131PRJ ) as currently scoped as a concerned neighbor.

I have reviewed the plans online and I understand that the project will create net new housing in San Francisco, which I appreciate is a priority for our community and this commission. My concerns are not about creating a 3 unit building, rather the current scope of the plans will negatively impact the downhill neighbors on Dolores St (myself included). The height of the proposed building is excessive compared with everything else on the block of Dolores between 23rd - 24th streets. They are using the uphill property as a benchmark, but if you consider the down hill neighbors sharing the same block of Dolores St there are absolutely no other 4 story buildings on that block of the street. Additionally, the lot slopes both downhill towards 23rd street as well as downhill towards the Quane avenue alley in the rear of the property rather significantly- the 40 ft height reaches the midpoint of what is a very pitched roof (over 45 feet tall at peak), and is measured from the highest possible sidewalk point at the front of the property- the reality then is that the rear of the building from the
low side of the lot is over 55 feet off the ground given the approximate slope grade.

The massive nature of this building impacts the light and air as well as the views of its two nearest downhill neighbors, including my own property at 1083 Dolores St. It very significantly impacts the next door building and its occupants.

I believe that you can still achieve a 3 unit building by reducing the height of the building to a 3 story building. You still have the bottom two units as designed, and you simply redesign the 3rd floor to match the layout more or less of the 2nd floor unit.

I would support this project fully and welcome it to the neighborhood if it was a more reasonably scoped 3 story, 3 unit building. This would maintain the character of the block in terms of height and would not have nearly the negative impact on light and air to the downhill neighbors.

Alternatively, if the commission will not limit the number of stories I ask that they limit the height by instituting a flat roof alternative and also require a rear set back on the 4th story that would reduce the negative impact of light and air on the surrounding properties.

I respect the commission's goal to try to create more housing in our city, but I also hope that you will consider the perspective of the neighbors whose enjoyment of their homes and potentially whose property values will be negatively impacted if you allow this project to move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Lara Caimi
Owner: 1083 Dolores St.
Dear President Myrna Melgar,
San Francisco Planning Commission

Please see attachment for Chinatown community organizations support letter for “Transbay Parcel F” Mixed-Use District Project.

Much Appreciated.

-Tan Chow
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Ms. Cushing,

I am writing in regards to the “Eligible for Closure” status granted by the San Francisco Department of Public Health Local Oversight Program for 1776 Green St., San Francisco, CA 94123. My family and I (young children ages 2 and 6-month Twins) live adjacent to this property and I am outraged over the negative impact and potential health and developmental problems this property presents; yet SFDPH appears apathetic. I request that you to revoke the “Eligible for Closure” status until further assessment and appropriate mitigation are completed. In addition, I demand a formal hearing in this matter.

As you are aware, 1776 Green Street is a highly contaminated site due to its prior use as an automotive repair and body shop for 100 years. Although the contaminated soil may be acceptable for commercial use, to apply the same standard for residential use is an outrage, knowing full well the residential cleanup requirements.

Closure of this site from the State’s Cortese list is inappropriate due to the toxic levels of...
carcinogenic chemicals noted in the many soil and groundwater samples tested. Furthermore, this property should not be converted to residential use until remedial action is taken. The obvious question is, what's the point of the Cortese List if local government fails to comply?

- The San Francisco Planning Department has recommended that 1776 Green St. be converted from commercial use to residential use. Furthermore, the proposed development project would require “up to approximately 15 feet of excavation below ground surface, resulting in approximately 1,400 cubic yards of soil disturbance.” Again, this soil is highly contaminated, and its disturbance and excavation will pose a danger to those in close proximity.

- The Case Closure Summary only recommends closure of the site for the “current land use,” which is listed as “commercial.” It also clearly states that if the land use changes, then further corrective action may be required and that “development will require additional site assessment and a Site Mitigation Plan prior to development,”

This site is close to several high traffic areas and thorough cleanup of the site to residential standards is critical to safeguard neighborhood residents and visitors, future residents of the 1776 Green Street, construction workers working on site, teachers and students at Sherman Elementary School, and visitors to Allyn Park and the Golden Gate Valley Branch Library.

Given the proposed residential development of 1776 Green St. and the potential threat to the health of all those in close proximity, I strongly urge you to revoke the “Eligible for Closure” status until further assessment and appropriate mitigation has been completed.

Sincerely,

Salem Mansoir
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:  Letitia Yang <letitia.yang@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2020 9:54 AM
To:  Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, CA (2018-011430CUA)

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

Please see below and the attached letter.

Thanks,
Letitia Yang

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Letitia Yang <letitia.yang@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jan 8, 2020 at 5:37 PM
Subject: 1776 Green Street | Letter re: "Eligible for Closure Status"
To: <stephanie.cushing@sfdph.org>

Dear Ms. Cushing,

Please find attached a letter regarding the "Eligible for Closure" status that has been granted to 1776 Green St, San Francisco. I will also send a hard copy by mail.

Kind regards,
Letitia Yang
1769 Green Street
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: Jane Ibrahim Gaito <janeibrahimgaito@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2020 10:43 AM
To: Cushing, Stephanie (DPH) <Stephanie.Cushing@sfdph.org>
Cc: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1776 Green Street: remain on Cortese List and require environmental review

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

Jane Ibrahim Gaito
1889 Green Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

January 9, 2020

Stephanie Cushing, MSPH, CHMM, REHS
Director of Environmental Health
San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
Environmental Health Services
Local Oversight Program
1390 Market Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 1776 Green Street, San Francisco CA 94123

Dear Ms. Cushing,
As a resident of Green Street, I am writing to express my deep concerns over the proposed project at 1776 Green Street. For the past 11 years, my family has lived one block away from the subject property. We are raising our 2 daughters here, and maintaining a safe neighborhood is critically important to us.

We support the redevelopment of the autobody shop into attractive and much needed housing. However, we urge the Department of Public Health and Planning Commission to require the necessary cleanup to ensure that development is done in a safe manner.

Do not remove this site from the Cortese list. 1776 Green Street is documented as a contaminated site on the State of California’s Cortese list. As such, in order to change its use from commercial to residential, it is subject to environmental review. This is critical in light of the 100 years of use as an autobody shop that regularly used contaminants, long before environmental regulations were in effect. The project sponsor proposes significant excavation and soil disturbance (1,400 cubic yards), which pose a serious health risk to neighbors, passersby, construction workers and future residents of the building. Despite efforts to clean the site in 2016, there remain high levels of contaminants in the soil and groundwater. The levels of benzene, which is widely accepted to cause leukemia, are unacceptably high: in the soil, 285 times allowable levels for residential use; in the groundwater, 900 times allowable levels for residential use.

The change in land use requires that this site be subject to environmental review. California law is unambiguous on this point. There is no justification for removing this site from the Cortese list other than to circumvent a critical public health requirement. It is unconscionable that the city would take steps to fast track a project by removing the site from the Cortese list and endangering the health of so many people with inadequate cleanup. It is the responsibility of the Department of Public Health to ensure that this site is developed safely by requiring an environmental review and safe mitigation of the documented contamination.

A full hearing should be held in the interest of complete transparency and accountability. Thank you in advance for preserving the health, safety and character of our beloved neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Jane Ibrahim Gaito
1889 Green Street
From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: 542-550 Howard Street (Transbay Parcel F) - Save car-free Natoma Street!
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 4:35:41 PM

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: Tom Radulovich <tom@livablecity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 3:58 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>
Cc: Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS) <abigail.rivamontemesa@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Foster, Nicholas (CPC) <nicholas.foster@sfgov.org>
Subject: 542-550 Howard Street (Transbay Parcel F) - Save car-free Natoma Street!

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

Dear President Melgar and Planning Commissioners,

On behalf of Livable City, I am writing to urge you to preserve the pedestrian enclave on Natoma Street between First and Second Street. It is currently the longest pedestrian street in SoMa, and the only pedestrianized block adjacent to the Salesforce Transit Center. The proposed Parcel F development, for which you are the legislative sponsor, currently threatens to irreparably destroy it. The current plan proposes replacing a car-free block with a driveway and private garage entry, eliminating most of the remaining car-free space and bringing hundreds of daily car trips onto this block of Natoma.

The region has spent billions of dollars building the Transit Center, and will spend billions more to extend Caltrain and High Speed Rail to the station, making it the most important transit hub in Northern California. It is also the center of the city’s densest and most transit-rich neighborhood. The regional transit center should be surrounded by walkable and bikeable streets and people-oriented public spaces. Unfortunately it is not – the surrounding streets are grim, dominated by automobile traffic and parking and loading dominate the streets and public spaces around the transit center. Each new development has to date has brought more traffic and more garage entrances. The block of Natoma between First and Second is the longest block fronting on the transit center, and currently the only block not dominated by traffic, parking, and loading. There is only one garage entry on the entire block, at its western end. Most of the block is currently pedestrian plaza, with food trucks lining parcel F. Ground-floor retail spaces in the terminal face onto Natoma, and once occupied they will further activate the
and enhance this car-free public open space. Destroying this pedestrian enclave is totally unnecessary. The Parcel F development can be car-free – helping move the neighborhood and City towards a more sustainable, less automobile-dominated, and more people oriented future. Parcel F’s location couldn’t be any more transit-rich, and it couldn’t be a better place for car-free residents to live or hotel guests to stay. Passenger and freight loading can be accommodated on Howard Street, with a protected bikeway preserving bike access. Any residents or hotel guests who insist on using private cars can park in various nearby buildings, which are over-supplied with parking for such a dense and transit-oriented neighborhood. As the neighborhood continues to get denser and the transit center gets busier, car-free Natoma Street will become an increasingly valuable neighborhood amenity.

Destroying car-free street next to the regional transit terminal is a very backwards move. San Francisco has cautiously begun to reclaim important public spaces from the automobile, to prioritize sustainable transportation and expand usable public open space in the most crowed districts of the city. Other cities - Paris, Mexico City, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Madrid, Copenhagen, etc. - are reclaiming public space more boldly, including expanding car-free public open spaces next to their principal transit stations. Destroying a car-free space next to our principal transit center to build a private garage is civic vandalism.

We are counting on your leadership to protect this invaluable car-free public space at the major transit hub in a crowded neighborhood. We ask that you require the Parcel F development to preserve this car-free street and enhance it with street-level uses, not destroy it with a driveway and a parking garage.

Sincerely,
Tom Radulovich
Executive Director
Livable City & Sunday Streets
301 8th Street, Suite 235
San Francisco CA 94103
415 344-0489
www.livablecity.org
tom@livablecity.org
Doug Ridgway <doug@dougridgway.com>

Wednesday, January 08, 2020 4:04 PM

To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>

Subject: 415 Native LLC / Dispensary Application

To Whom it May Concern

I’m writing to the Commission in support of the conditional use permit to open 415 Native LLC, a cannabis retail location in Hayes Valley (313 Ivy).

My Business is located approximately a block away on Octavia and I have come to know Angel (one of the owners) through various community organizations and events, including her participation in the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Assn Holiday Block Party.

Angel is a high quality operator who is a much appreciated and crucial energy in the Hayes Valley Business Community. Fig & Thistle (a business owned by her and two other partners) is a highly regarded and valuable asset in the community.

It’s my feeling that allowing the conditional use change — especially to a group that has operated at a high standard and made significant contributions to the neighborhood — will be a benefit to the Hayes Valley commercial corridor. I encourage the Commission to approve the application.

Doug Ridgway
Hello,

In advance of the hearing set for tomorrow, please see the letter that I submitted to the DPH today re: 1776 Green Street.

Sincerely,
Youjeong Kim

----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: Youjeong Kim <ykimellis@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020, 02:20:37 PM PST  
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Subject: 1776 Green St.

Dear Ms. Cushing,

I am writing to you regarding the “Eligible for Closure” status granted by the San Francisco
Department of Public Health Local Oversight Program for 1776 Green St., San Francisco, CA 94123. My family and I (with young children ages 6 and 8) live directly across from the property and as a physician and surgeon I am very concerned about the negative impact this may have on the health and well being of not only my immediate family and children, but my community. I request that you revoke the “Eligible for Closure” status until further assessment and appropriate mitigation has been completed, and I also request a formal hearing regarding this matter.

1776 Green Street is a highly contaminated site due to its prior use as an automotive repair shop for approximately 100 years, including many decades when environmental laws were non-existent. I am certain that you are aware of the toxic levels of carcinogenic chemicals noted in the many soil and groundwater samples tested at this site.

This site should not be eligible for closure, and I believe this may have been an oversight in that this property is being converted to residential use.

- The San Francisco Planning Department has recommended that 1776 Green St. be converted from commercial use to residential use. Furthermore, the proposed development project would require “up to approximately 15 feet of excavation below ground surface, resulting in approximately 1,400 cubic yards of soil disturbance.” Again, this soil is highly contaminated, and its disturbance and excavation will pose a danger to those in close proximity.

- The Case Closure Summary only recommends closure of the site for the “current land use,” which is listed as “commercial.” It also clearly states that if the land use changes, then further corrective action may be required and that “development will require additional site assessment and a Site Mitigation Plan prior to development.”

This site is close to several high traffic areas and thorough cleanup of the site to residential standards is critical to safeguard neighborhood residents and visitors, future residents of the 1776 Green Street, construction workers working on site, teachers and students at Sherman Elementary School, and visitors to Allyne Park and the Golden Gate Valley Branch Library.

Given the proposed residential development of 1776 Green St. and the potential threat to the health of all those in close proximity, I strongly urge you to revoke the “Eligible for Closure” status until further assessment and appropriate mitigation has been completed.

Thank you for your consideration.
Youjeong Kim
1775 Green Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
Dear Commissioners:

I write to correct two typos in my email. References to "2417" in the final paragraph should have been to "2421".

Thank you,

Jessica MacGregor

On Wed, Jan 8, 2020 at 2:36 PM Jessica MacGregor <macgregor.jessicabeth@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Commissioners:

It was my intention to appear at the hearing tomorrow; however, I am unable to do so. Please accept this email in lieu of my appearance.

My husband and I live at 2460 Green Street, directly across from 2421 Green Street. We write to urge the Commission to reject the Planning Department’s PMND and require the issuance of an EIR.
I appeared before the Board of Supervisors two years ago to ask that it find the CEQA exemption issued for the proposed project at 2417 Green was in error. The Board unanimously so found.

In the intervening two years the historic significance and fragility of the Ernest Coxhead home at 2417 has been acknowledged by both the Planning Department and the Developer. In this same period of time the Developer has racked up Notices of Violation – demonstrating that he, like many developers who have drawn the Commission’s scrutiny, has bargained that asking for forgiveness is more efficient than asking for permission. And the home has been left to deteriorate. Against this backdrop, the Planning Department proposes to permit commencement of construction, even though it is very likely to damage this unique and irreplaceable historic landmark. The conduct to date suggests it is not advisable to simply trust the Developer will proceed carefully or cautiously or even that he will follow the limitations of permits issued. Given the historic nature of 2417 and its unique features that make it extremely susceptible to irreparable harm, we urge the Commission to reject the PMND and instead direct the issuance of an EIR.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica MacGregor
David MacGregor
2460 Green Street
SF, CA 94123
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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 3:07 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Support from California State Treasurer Fiona Ma for 313 Ivy Street

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

Please see attached.
From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: 2417 Green Street - SF Superior Court Case No. CGC-19-580677
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 3:08:15 PM
Attachments:
2019.11.19 CCC Sheet (endorsed).pdf
2019.11.19 Summons (endorsed).pdf
2019.11.08 Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate & Complaint for Dec & Injunctive Relief (endorsed).pdf
2019.11.08 Notice of Intent to Commence Writ of Mandate (endorsed).pdf
2019.11.22 Notice of Election to Prep AR (endorsed).pdf
2019.11.08 POS Summons SF Planning Commission.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: Julie Du <julie@zfplaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; STACY, KATE (CAT) <Kate.Stacy@sfcityatty.org>; Ryan Patterson <ryan@zfplaw.com>; Sarah Hoffman <sarah@zfplaw.com>; JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT) <Kristen.Jensen@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: 2417 Green Street - SF Superior Court Case No. CGC-19-580677

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

Good afternoon President Melgar & Commissioners:

Please find attached a courtesy copy of the following documents:

1. Civil Case Cover Sheet
2. Summons
3. Notice of Intent to Commence Writ of Mandate
4. Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate & Complaint for Declaratory & Injunctive Relief
5. Notice of Election to Prepare Administrative Record
6. Proof of Service of Summons to Planning Commission on 11/8/19
Sincerely,

Julie Du
Administrative Assistant
Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 956-8100
Facsimile: (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies. Unless expressly stated, nothing in this communication should be regarded as tax advice.
Commissioners,

Attached is an updated case report for the Sustainable City Framework informational item on tomorrow’s Agenda.

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

Lisa Fisher
Senior Urban Planner, Resilience + Sustainability Lead
San Francisco Planning Department, Citywide Division
Direct: 415-575-8715
lisa.fisher@sfgov.org

Hi Jonas – Please forward to the Planning Commission in advance of tomorrow’s hearing.

Thanks,
Hi Lisa,

We can’t modify the online version at this time as it has to remain the same as the printed version we sent the commissioners last week. Instead, we can share with the commissioners electronically via email and I’d recommend you identify any big changes during your presentation.

Christine

Hello, Not sure if you saw the below email yesterday, but attached is the updated case report PDF. Please let me know if I should bring print-outs tomorrow for the Commissioners.

thanks

Lisa Fisher
Senior Urban Planner, Resilience + Sustainability Lead
San Francisco Planning Department, Citywide Division
Direct: 415-575-8715

Thank you.

In other news, we have revised the case report with some new info that’s come in since end of Dec – should I bring printed copies to the hearing or it just gets sent to the Commissioners electronically? Ideally, we would like this version to be the one used in the final online public record.

Thanks for your advice,

Lisa
Hi Lisa – Unfortunately, timing all depends on the amount of public comment items receive so we aren’t able to give good estimates.

Christine

We don't know either.

Thank you,
Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

Hi,
I’ve had several people ask me when I think my item (#11) will go on this Thursday – I know it’s a guess, but maybe you have a better sense than me?

Thanks for any insights,
Lisa
Commissioner Moore,

After receiving your phone message, I am forwarding you, and the Commission, the requested shadow information.

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

Hi Jonas:

Attached, please find:

- The shadow analysis for Parcel F (performed by Fastcast)
- CPC Motion No. 18717 (2012 Planning Commission Motion authorizing increase of ACLs for 7 parks identified by TCDP)
- RPC Resolution No. 1210-001 (2012 Rec and Park Commission authorizing increase of ACLs for 7 parks identified by TCDP)
- RPC Resolution No. 1919-016 (2019 Rec and Park Commission recommending to CPC no adverse use to either of the two subject RPD properties)
- RPC Staff Packet (2019 Rec and Park Commission hearing packet)

If there is any additional information I can provide, please let me know.

Thanks,

Nicholas Foster, AICP, LEED GA
Senior Planner | Northeast Team | Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9167 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map
To whom it may concern:

Please find my attached letter of support for Stay Gold located at 669 Mississippi St. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jonathan R. Cummings
+1.813.541.6001
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Diamond, Susan (CPC); Fung, Frank (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC)
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: Letter of Support - 415 Native LLC
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 12:26:09 PM

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: Jonathan R. Cummings <cummingsjr1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 11:09 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Letter of Support - 415 Native LLC

Copy with signature.

Jonathan R. Cummings
+1.813.541.6001

On Tue, Jan 7, 2020 at 11:04 AM Jonathan R. Cummings <cummingsjr1@gmail.com> wrote:

To whom it may concern:

Please find my attached letter of support for 415 Native LLC located at 313 Ivy St. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jonathan R. Cummings
+1.813.541.6001
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: Chris Callaway <chris1callaway@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 12:33 PM
To: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support Letter Mr.C's 500 Laguna

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Letter of Support received for Mr.C’s 500 Laguna.

------------ Forwarded message -----------
From: Rae Roth <ray611@icloud.com>
Date: Fri, Jan 3, 2020 at 8:22 PM
Subject: Mr. C dispensary public hearing
To: <chris1callaway@gmail.com>

Hello,

I noticed there was a public hearing regarding opening a dispensary on the corner of Fell & Laguna under Mr. C.
I live in Hayes neighborhood at 100 Van ness ave and wanted to express my support for this initiative. I’ve been highly disappointed from online dispensaries and looking forward to supporting
your local business.

That corner location has been empty for a long while now, right beside such lively streets. Please let me know if I can help in any way.

Best,

Rae
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Diamond, Susan (CPC); Fung, Frank (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC)
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: PC letter for Angel
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 12:25:37 PM
Attachments: support letter for Angel.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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 12:43 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: PC letter for Angel

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

Please see attached

Murrey E. Nelson
Director of Development
CHANTICLEER
1668 Bush Street
San Francisco, CA  94109
415-230-2511 (direct)
415-252-7941 (fax)
mnelson@chanticleer.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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 12:45 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: 313 Ivy Support Letter

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

Please see attached.
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Diamond, Susan (CPC); Fung, Frank (CPC); Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC);
Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC)
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: Letter of Support for 669 Mississippi
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 12:25:19 PM
Attachments: SG_Support_Richard.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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 12:46 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM)
<officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Support for 669 Mississippi

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

Please see attached.
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: Christine Hille <christine_hille@yahoo.de>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 2:35 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: Letter of support

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Dear San Francisco Planning Commissioners,

As a San Francisco resident for 24 years and an EcoDistricts accredited professional myself, I am thrilled to see your department leveraging and eco-districts approach to inform San Francisco’s neighborhood plans. Your Agenda #11 Thursday “Sustainable Neighborhoods Framework” is a great step forward in the City’s leadership on addressing climate change, and building healthy, equitable, and resilient neighborhoods.

Arup is a global employee-owned firm designers, planners, engineers, architects, consultants and technical specialists, working across every aspect of today’s built environment. We are supportive of advancing the proposed Sustainable Neighborhood Program, and look forward to the Commission’s discussion tomorrow – and action in upcoming meetings.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Kate White, MPA, EcoDistricts AP
Associate Principal | Planning | Policy

Arup
560 Mission Street  Suite 700  San Francisco  CA  94105  USA
t: + 1 415 957 9445  d: +1 415 946 0752
m: +1 415 652 9516
www.arup.com

Electronic mail messages entering and leaving Arup business systems are scanned for viruses and acceptability of content.
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: Kristen DiStefano <kristen.distefano@atelierten.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 5:13 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Fisher, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.fisher@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2019-023145CWP: Sustainable Neighborhoods Item

Dear Commissioners,

I’m writing to express my support for the San Francisco Sustainable Neighborhoods Program. I am an Associate Director at Atelier Ten and I have worked as a sustainability consultant to define the sustainability approach for master planning projects such as Mission Rock, India Basin, and Potrero Power Station. I have also worked as part of a team contracted directly to OEWD and the Mayor’s Office to compare the sustainability plans for San Francisco’s southern waterfront developments and identify common sustainability metrics and themes for the projects.

For the past 1 ½ years we have been working with the Planning Department to pilot the Sustainable Neighborhood Framework beta on Potrero Power Station. The Framework provides clear guidance on the City’s priorities with regard to sustainability and climate resilience. The Sustainable Neighborhood Road Map also provides a consistent format to summarize project-specific sustainability requirements and aspirations.

Our team used the Sustainable Neighborhood Road Map as an organizational tool within our design standards document. The Road Map provided a single location to summarize project-specific standards, guidelines, and considerations related to sustainability within the larger design document. As sustainable design issues become seamlessly integrated into design documents, this organizational mechanism is critical for streamlined project review and coordination.
I’m excited to see this program move forward in support of the City’s ambitious sustainability goals.

Sincerely,
Kristen DiStefano

Kristen DiStefano, LEED AP BD+C
Associate Director

Atelier Ten
Environmental Design Consultants + Lighting Designers
443 Tehama Street, 1st Floor
San Francisco CA 94103
T +1 (415) 351 2100 x103
kristen.distefano@atelierten.com

www.atelierten.com
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: Gretchen Buck <gbuck@absinthe.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 7:43 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: Letter of Support for 415 Native LLC

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

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,
Gretchen Buck
Dear Planning Commissioners,
I am writing to show support for 415 Native, LLC dba Stay Gold, a cannabis retail location at 669 Mississippi Street, in San Francisco, California. Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open Stay Gold through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered. It is my opinion that Stay Gold will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and consumption. I believe there will be added value to the community if they are awarded the license that would allow Stay Gold to operate a cannabis retail dispensary and consumption lounge at their building located on Mississippi St. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,
Gretchen Buck
135 Valencia Street, SF, CA 94103
tthisisgretchen@gmail.com
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native, LLC dba Stay Gold, a cannabis retail location at 669 Mississippi Street, in San Francisco, California. Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open Stay Gold through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.
It is my opinion that Stay Gold will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and consumption. I believe there will be added value to the community if they are awarded the license that would allow Stay Gold to operate a cannabis retail dispensary and consumption lounge at their building located on Mississippi St. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,

Justan Fondbertasse
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both
welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered. It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,
Justan Fondbertasse
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: Chris Callaway <chris1callaway@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 500 Laguna Support Letters

Hi Bridget,

Here are a few more letters of support I received from residents last summer in reference to the Laguna 500 Arts Project I started to activate Mr.C's vacant space while in permitting. I hope they can help paint a picture of my efforts to engage with the community in positive ways.

Thanks,

Chris Callaway, CEO
Mr.C's
415-802-6160
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

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Hulme <aaron@radhaus.sf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2020 11:16 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: In support of Angel Davis, 313 Ivy, SF Equity Program

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

Hello SF Planning Commissioners,

Please see my letter in support – as a fellow SF business owner – for 313 Ivy attached here:

Sincerely,

Aaron Hulme
BIERGARTEN / RADHAUS
Dear Commissioners,

I will not be able to attend this week's commission hearing in person, so instead I am writing to you to voice my support for the Sustainable Neighborhood Program and Framework that has been under development by San Francisco Planning staff.

One of the reasons that I became an urban designer was to positively impact the way cities are built, making it easier for us to make more sustainable choices and reduce our carbon footprint. The built environment accounts for 40% of the carbon emissions created, and with each new building we have an opportunity to help people live in a way that is less resource intensive. The opportunities then multiply at the district scale - particularly with new developments, were we can connect buildings together to share resources more efficiently, build a public realm that will capture carbon, and design our streets and transportation systems so that people can easily and safely walk or bike instead of being dependent on their cars.

Over the last decade we have all come to realize how imperative it is that we make a change immediately. Pair this with San Francisco's need to build dramatically more housing, and we can see...
that this coming decade of building will be our most critical to excel in building high-performance communities.

As a professional urban designer, I have worked on several redevelopment plans in San Francisco that created sustainability strategies as part of their entitlements process, including Mission Rock and the Potrero Power Station. When I was working on Mission Rock, the framework was not yet in place, and - while I believe we arrived at a fantastic sustainability plan - the process to get there was complex and long, because there were no clear goals or targets yet established by the City for what was required from a sustainability plan. Later, when I was working on the Potrero Power Station D4D, this framework was under development, and our team volunteered to help pilot its use.

My experience working with the framework was that it was immensely helpful to have a clear set of goals and targets identified by the City, that were already aligned with SF’s Climate Action Plan and other sustainability initiatives. It provided clarity and direction on several important fronts:
1. Common metrics and definitions for sustainability goals and strategies
2. A series of baseline requirements as well as stretch goals
3. An holistic framework for thinking about sustainability from the perspective of resource management, community health, and financial feasibility - all aligned with City policy.

When developing a sustainability plan, it is important to remember that each site should have a different set of strategies and goals based on its context, location, proposed mix of uses, and site characteristics. Also, I believe there should be room for developers to choose to innovate in specific areas that are most aligned with their interests and experience. But, the only way that we can ensure that each project being developed is moving us collectively toward achieving our sustainability targets, is by beginning from the same understanding of metrics, policy goals, and desired outcomes. This framework does a great job at setting the stage for innovation, creativity, and our future success.

Thank you,
Kristen Hall
Owner, Kristen Hall City Design
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Wednesday, January 8, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED INAUGURATED AS MAYOR OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today took the Mayoral Oath of Office and delivered a speech in the City Hall Rotunda before a crowd of approximately 700 people. Today’s ceremony was Mayor Breed’s second inauguration and marks the beginning of her first four-year term as the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco. Mayor Breed was reelected in November 2019 with 70.7% of the vote.

Mayor Breed spoke about the challenges of housing affordability and homelessness in San Francisco, and laid out a vision for addressing them. She called for building at least 50,000 new homes in the next decade, supporting policies that allow for more multi-family housing, meeting her goal of opening 1,000 new shelter beds, adding additional mental health beds and services, and opening more Permanent Supportive Housing.
“Homelessness isn’t just a problem; it’s a symptom. The symptom of unaffordable housing, of income inequality, of institutional racism, of addiction, untreated illness; and decades of disinvestment. These are the problems. And if we’re going to fight homelessness, we’ve got to fight them all.

To be clear, with these efforts will come a measure of ‘Tough Love.’ We are no longer accepting that “compassion” means anything goes on our streets. Yes, many people are sick and we will offer them help, but if they don’t want—or can’t—accept services, then we will bring them into treatment. We will continue to expand our services, shelter, and housing so that there is a place for everyone in need. And when we have a place for people to go, we cannot allow them to languish on the sidewalk. It’s not humane, it’s not compassionate, and it’s not safe for anyone.”

**Housing**

“Frankly, I am tired of hearing about our ‘housing crisis.’ Crises are unpredictable; they happen suddenly, and policymakers generally try to avoid them. Our housing problems were entirely predictable. They are the result of decades of almost intentional under-building, and the decision decades ago to down-zone almost three-quarters of the city and ban apartments.

We don’t have a housing crisis. We have a housing shortage.

I’m committed to working with my fellow Mayors across the region and the state to create more housing, because, just like homelessness, this is a regional and statewide issue. I will be going to Sacramento to fight for these changes. Because we need more homes for workers, families, and seniors. Because our retail shops and restaurants can’t hire people who can afford to live here. Because San Francisco should be viable for all San Franciscans.

We cannot say we need more housing, and then reject policies that allow us to actually build that housing. I was not here decades ago when we imposed restrictive laws to prevent new housing, but I will be here when we start building more homes throughout San Francisco and the entire Bay Area again.”

For the complete text of Mayor Breed’s inauguration speech, go to: [https://sfmayor.org/mayor-london-n-breeds-2020-inauguration-speech](https://sfmayor.org/mayor-london-n-breeds-2020-inauguration-speech).

For the video of the Inauguration Ceremony, go to: [https://sfgovtv.org/mayorbreedinauguration](https://sfgovtv.org/mayorbreedinauguration).

Kayla Smith of Project LEVEL emceed the event, and Father Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J., President of the University of San Francisco, delivered the invocation. The Galileo High School JROTC conducted the Posting of the Colors. Musical selections during the Inauguration Ceremony were performed by the George Washington High School Marching Band and Katie Kadan, musical artist and former competitor on “The Voice.”

The Honorable Judge Teri L. Jackson of the San Francisco Superior Court administered the Mayoral Oath of Office to Mayor Breed. Following Mayor Breed’s speech, Carlos Santana, with special guest Yolanda Adams, concluded the ceremony with a musical performance.

###
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am a resident of the Sunset District and I am fully supportive of my new neighbor, Kai Chan, wanting to maximize the number of new homes on this huge lot at 2169 26th Avenue. I am excited that from only one current home, Kai is creating not only a 2nd home, but also the opportunity to add a 3rd and a 4th thanks to ADUs. From one home to four, this is a no brainer: DO NOT TAKE discretionary review and APPROVE the project. This is entirely legal and sorely needed until RH-1 is made illegal in San Francisco.

As long as we have RH-1 zoning, this is the kind of project we need to have and approve right away as to not clog our planning process. Do not incentivize future DR requests by even entertaining this one!

Thank you,

Staly Chin
stalychin@gmail.com
Dear Katy,

Good morning and Happy New Year to you and Mr. Ionin as well.

Attached are two photos of a tree located next to the garage for this project. One photo is of the full tree and the other one is a close-up showing the leaves.

I believe it is a Monkey Puzzle Tree (Araucaria Araucana).

Will this tree be preserved in the yard of the new project?

Apparently there is one in the Salesforce Park and they are rare in California. It is native to Chile where it is an endangered tree, even though it is the national tree of Chile.

If you search for Monkey Puzzle Tree SF you can see the article about the Salesforce Park that mentions this fact. It is a very unique looking tree.

Sorry for the late comment about the tree just two days prior to the hearing.

Thanks and have a good day.

Georgia

Sent from my iPad
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Tuesday, January 7, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES 151 UNITS OF HOUSING FOR HOMELESS AND FORMERLY HOMELESS ADULTS

The City will fund new housing at The Abigail and The Post Hotels, including permanent supportive housing

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced the City will open 151 units of housing for homeless and formerly homeless adults at The Abigail Hotel and The Post Hotel. Following the announcement, Mayor Breed toured The Abigail Hotel, which is undergoing renovations and will open this spring. The City will provide funding to the Tenderloin Housing Clinic and Episcopal Community Services to lease the 62-unit Abigail Hotel and the 89-unit Post Hotel, respectively. These new units are part of Mayor Breed’s efforts to open more than 450 additional units of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) by the end of 2020.

“Shelter is an important part of our homeless response system and is essential for meeting the immediate needs of our neighbors in crisis, but housing is the solution to homelessness,” said Mayor Breed. “These new homes not only provide permanent housing for formerly homeless
people, they also open up more spaces in our shelter system for people who are currently living on the streets. Addressing this crisis requires more housing at all types, and these 151 homes will make an important difference for those who are ready to start the next chapter in their lives.”

“The journeys each of the people we helped out of homelessness 2019 give us hope as we begin the New Year,” said Jeff Kositsky, Director of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. “I’m excited that 2020 begins with a more coordinated, data-driven Homelessness Response System paired with more housing exits created through the courageous leadership of Mayor Breed and the compassion and hard work of our team, partners, and community.”

Permanent Supportive Housing provides long-term affordable housing with on-site social services to people exiting chronic homelessness. Currently, over 10,800 people live in the City’s PSH. Last year, Mayor Breed allocated $7.6 million in Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds to support the master leasing of 300 new units of PSH.

The Abigail Hotel is a vacant 62-unit updated Single Room Occupancy Hotel in the Civic Center area. All rooms in The Abigail have a private bathroom and the building includes a spacious lobby and dining facility on the first floor. Tenderloin Housing Clinic will manage The Abigail for residents of PSH who no longer need supportive services and can live independently. The units they vacate then become available to persons leaving shelters and the streets.

“The Tenderloin Housing Clinic began assisting Abigail Hotel tenants in 1980, when a new owner sought to illegally evict them and illegally covert to a 100% tourist hotel,” Randy Shaw, Executive Director, Tenderloin Housing Clinic (THC). “This makes our leasing of the hotel for supportive housing particularly meaningful for THC and the legacy of Tenderloin activism.”

The Post Hotel is an SRO building in the Union Square area with 89 units, 65 of which will be available immediately once the building is ready for occupancy. Eligibility for the PSH units is determined by the City’s Coordinated Entry prioritization process, which is based on vulnerability, length of homelessness, and barriers to housing.

“Permanent supportive housing is a proven solution to ending homelessness for our most vulnerable neighbors. The opening of the Post Hotel will provide us with 89 solutions, moving us closer toward our collective goal of ending chronic homelessness in San Francisco,” said Beth Stokes, Executive Director of Episcopal Community Services.

In 2017, Tipping Point Community launched its Chronic Homelessness Initiative to partner with the City to reduce chronic homelessness by 50% in five years. Tipping Point has worked closely with the City to deploy philanthropic dollars in support of the most effective and promising homelessness reduction strategies. Tipping Point is providing over $3 million to the City’s provider partners for a wide range of needs for the 300 master leased units, including apartment repairs and new furniture. The flexible funding provided allows the City to move forward knowing that these costs are covered, and that its resources will go to more fixed, long-term costs like supportive services and ongoing rental subsidies.

Daniel Lurie, Chairman of the Board of Tipping Point Community stated, “Homelessness is a complex challenge that requires the public, private, and philanthropic sectors to effectively address this crisis by creating the solutions necessary to meet the challenge. Public-private
partnerships like this one demonstrate how we can better work together toward our common goal of reducing homelessness and making San Francisco a healthier, more vibrant city for everyone.”

Every night, the City provides shelter and housing to over 13,400 homeless and formerly homeless people across the community. This includes over 3,400 temporary shelter beds, and over 10,000 people in PSH. To expand this effort, Mayor Breed announced a goal to open 1,000 new shelter beds by the end of 2020. Since that announcement in October 2018, the City has opened 566 beds, currently has 24 beds under construction, and has announced 200 beds in the Bayview and has proposed 75 beds in a Navigation Center for Transitional Age Youth at 888 Post Street.

###
Dear President Melgar and Honorable Members of the Planning Commission,

Attached please find correspondence regarding 2417 Green Street: Appeal of Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration (2017-002545ENV). Please note hard copies will follow by overnight mail. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Best,

Toyer Grear  
Office Manager / Paralegal  
Lozeau Drury, LLP  
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150  
Oakland, CA 94612  
email: toyer@lozeaudrury.com  
phone: 510-836-4200 / fax: 510-836-4205
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

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: Lorrie French <lorrie@lorriefrench.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2020 3:41 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: Letter of Support

Please see attached letter of support for 313 Ivy Street.

Best Regards,

Lorrie French
Compass
Broker Associate – CIPS, GRI, RRC, SRES
License # 00910990
415.297.8071

COMPASS
1699 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94109
415.297.8071
lorrie@lorriefrench.com | www.lorriefrench.com

“Where the Accent is on Service” Your referrals are appreciated!
Please consider the environment before printing this email

I have not verified nor will verify or investigate any third-party information or reports.
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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2020 2:57 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: 313 Ivy Street Letter of Support

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

Please see attached.
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: angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2020 3:20 PM
To: Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support Letter for 669 Mississippi (415 LLC)

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

Please see attached
From: Stephen <grovestand2012@gmail.com>
Date: January 4, 2020 at 10:19:40 PM PST
To: Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org
Cc: kpeterson@mercyhousing.org, kpeterson@mercyhousing.org, prestonstaff@sfgov.org, dean/preston@sfgov.org, president@hayesvalleysf.org, foundation@sfrealtors.com, Boiz & Girlz Club Carter Ashforth <cashforth@kidsclub.org>, Emma Hamer <ehamer@mercyhousing.org>, Stephen Malloy <grovestand2012@gmail.com>

Subject: 1-4-20 Mr. C Cannabis Drug Dispensary at 500 Laguna-Citizen Negative Support & Unanswered “School” & Federal Violation ?s

To: Ms. Hicks
My name is Stephen Malloy and I live at 455 Fell across the street from the proposed location.

I walk by the proposed site every day, usually a couple of times at least per day, with my little service dog Ziggy since I live across the street.

Also, the 21 Hayes Muni Bus Stop is just a block away.

This is why I noticed your Zoning and Planning Poster at 500 Laguna for “Mr. C’s.”

A. Children & Families live here.

I therefore think a Cannabis Drug Dispensary is not appropriate.

B. Hayes Valley includes families in our neighborhood. There is the “Hayes Valley” Community Playground 1 block over and 1/2 a block up, from the proposed Cannabis Drug Dispensary.

I therefore think a Cannabis Drug Dispensary is not appropriate.

C. Sober members from drugs and alcohol, in the recovery community, reside/work here.

I therefore think a Cannabis Drug Dispensary is not appropriate.

D. “School.” The zoning law on your poster says that a cannabis drug dispensary cannot
be built within 600 feet of a school.

I submit that my home at 455 Fell will be the site of a Mercy Housing “Financial Empowerment Center” for the Community.


As such, we will have citizens: parents, children, visitors coming to 455 Fell which is right across the street from 500 Laguna for classes and training.

In short, I offer that my home is within 600 feet, is part of a ”school” and therefore this disqualifies Mr. C’s planning request.

I therefore think a Cannabis Drug Dispensary is not appropriate.

May I know your answer to my “school” assertion please Ms. Hicks?

2. There are already a number of Cannabis Dispensaries throughout the City.

There is a ready supply and easy access, for cannabis clientele in the City.

I offer that it is not appropriate, nor essential, to the neighborhood for a Cannabis Drug Dispensary to be zoned here.

I believe there are more suitable locations, that I’m sure would happily host Mr. C’s, elsewhere in San Francisco.

3. Mr. C’s has a letter posted next to your Planning Committee Poster in the potential sites window at 500 Laguna.

In that letter he essential states words to the effect that they:

“...don’t want any smoking or use of the cannabis drug outside of the site...”

This is San Francisco and Mr. C’s cannot establish that requirement, concerning the public streets, outside their potential Cannabis Drug Dispensary.
That claim falls flat with this potential neighbor and assured me that it is not in my or the communities best interests, particularly in San Francisco which does not “police” cannabis use on public sidewalks.

I don’t believe or accept that statement from Mr. C’s. They are a business owner focused on profit to survive, and that false statement alone tells me they are not focused on me or my community. For they cannot and will not police the use of cannabis once sold, on the sidewalks that I have to navigate to enter my home.

Yes potential customers can and will, like they do on every other block and street there is a Cannabis Drug Dispensary in the City.

I do not want to breathe, for me, secondhand toxic cannabis drug smoke as I pass Mr. C’s to cross the street to my home.

I therefore think a Cannabis Drug Dispensary is not appropriate.

4. My home is also a Federally Funded Housing Complex.

I have not researched this question yet, and it may impact your ability to potentially zone a For Profit Cannabis Drug Dispensary, within 50 feet of a Federally Subsidized Housing Complex.

What are the legal requirements, if any, concerning zoning and planning requirements within proximity to Federally Funded Facilities?

May I know your answer on that please Ms. Hicks?

5. Thank you for your consideration in this matter where I as a potential neighbor and citizen, want to voice my intense opposition to the proposed approval of Mr. C Cannabis Drug Dispensary at 500 Laguna.

Stephen Malloy
1/6/2020

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the
food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,

Jannea Tschirch

2644 Alemany Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94112
Jtschirch@yahoo.com
1/6/2020

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for Stay Gold, a cannabis retail location at 669 Mississippi St. San Francisco, California. Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open Stay Gold through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the
betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that Stay Gold will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and consumption. I believe there will be added value to the community if they are awarded the license that would allow Stay Gold to operate a cannabis retail dispensary and consumption lounge at their building located on Mississippi St. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,

Jannea Tschirch

2644 Alemany Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94112
Jtschirch@yahoo.com
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: Daniel Lee <danyolsan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2020 1:24 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM)
<officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com
Subject: Letter of Support for 415 Native LLC @ 313 Ivy St

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

Please find letter attached. Thank you!

Daniel Lee
415.272.1819
danyolsan.com
@danyolsan
Dear Planning Commissioners,

Please find my letters of support.

Sincerely,

Kristie Tacey, CSW
Owner & Winemaker
Tessier Winery

https://www.tessierwinery.com/contact

Mobile: 510-295-5858

Instagram: @tessierwinery/ Twitter: @wineaux7/ Facebook: @tessierpinot

New Labels - Science as Art

"A bottle of wine contains more philosophy than all the books in the world." --Louis Pasteur
From: 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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason M Henderson <Jhenders@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2020 10:35 AM
To: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; brokenspectacles@gmail.com; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: HVNA T & P Support of 313 Ivy Street Cannabis Dispensary CU at CPC Jan 23rd 2020

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

Dear Ms. Hicks and Planning Commissioners,

As chair of the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association's Transportation and Planning Committee, I want to express my full support for the CU for a cannabis dispensary at 313 Ivy Street. I am currently out of the country until the end of January so will not be able to speak at the Jan 23rd Planning Commission Hearing, but I want to share a few observations about the proprietor - Angel Davis.

You cannot get a more solid, community-engaged and responsive business owner than Angel Davis. Angel has been an active member of HVNA for over seven years, and HVNA wholeheartedly supported her first business - Fig and Thistle. Angel is now running two storefronts in the Market and Octavia Plan Area and I've only heard positive comments from neighbors.

In the Market and Octavia Plan area, green mobility (cycling, walking, public transit) are central to the plan, and Angel has always been a strong supporter of these goals.

As far as potential traffic issues on Ivy and Gough, I've discussed this with Angel. There's an existing problem at the junction of Ivy and Gough with TNC drop offs and pickups, related to the wider Hayes Valley commercial district. This reminds us that the city needs to be more proactive in identifying a designated pickup/dropoff zone and not leaving it to the whims of TNC users and TNC drivers. Please remind your colleagues that HVNA has been asking for this for years. But this should not fall on 313 Ivy to resolve. Planning needs to coordinate with SFMTA and get this sorted out.

If you have any further questions about HVNA's T & P Committee perspective, please do not hesitate to reach out (although I'm in the New Zealand bush, so spotty reception).
best wishes and happy new year

Jason Henderson
Chair, Hayes Valley NA Transportation and Planning Committee

--
Jason Henderson
San Francisco CA
94102
1/5/20

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market...
and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Chandran Param

Chandran Param
960 61st Street
Oakland Ca 94608
Chandranparam@gmail.com
925-788-9896
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: Angel Davis <angel@figandthistlesf.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 05, 2020 9:03 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; Angel Davis <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Letter of Support for Angel // Fig & Thistle is Moving!

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Suzanne Roberts <suzanne.roberts@tartinebakery.com>
Date: Sun, Jan 5, 2020 at 2:04 PM
Subject: Re: Letter of Support for Angel // Fig & Thistle is Moving!
To: Angel Davis <angel@figandthistlesf.com>

Support letters for 313 Ivy Street and 669 Mississippi for 415 Native.

--
--

Suzanne Roberts
General Manager | Tartine Manufactory
San Francisco, California
W: 415.757.0007
C: 949.887.5880
www.tartinebakery.com
Hi-

Please see attached for my letter in support of the CUA for Cannabis Retail at 313 Ivy St.

Thanks,

-matt

--

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

Hello
Please see my attached letters of support for 415 Native LLC at 313 Ivy St. and also Stay Gold at 669 Mississippi street.
Thank you for your consideration of these letters.
best
Robert
1/6/2020

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94104. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community. Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the
neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Sincerely,

______ Xan deVoss ________________________________
Signature

Xan deVoss
763 Haight Street 94117

xan@foxandlionbread.com
Xan DeVoss
Fox and Lion Bread
5273 3rd Street SF 94124
415-872-9789
President Melgar and Members of the SF Planning Commission,

We are the owners and long-time residents of the property located at 2710 Broadway, south of, and a portion of which is adjacent to, 2727 Vallejo. We recently learned that the property is proposed for a massive expansion of three levels and a roof deck to the rear, and strongly oppose the project as currently proposed for the following reasons.

First, the proposed expansion will eliminate a significant portion of the mid-block open space at the eastern end of our block. As you know, the preservation of mid-block open space in our Cow Hollow Neighborhood is a priority, as provided in the Cow Hollow Neighborhood Design Guidelines, and the Project is inconsistent with such preservation.

Second, we are concerned that the project as proposed requires a variance from Planning Code requirements for side yard set backs, to accommodate an enormous doubling in size of the existing house. We respectfully request that the project be required, at a minimum, to comply with existing code requirements without approval of a variance.
Finally, we have serious concerns regarding the impacts of construction and excavation, particularly when considered in combination with the other expansion projects that are pervading the neighborhood. While the exact amount and scope of excavation involved is not clear, to minimize impacts, we request that the project be modified to eliminate the expansion of the existing one-car garage to create what appears to be an underground, three-car garage.

We ask that you please carefully consider this project in the context of the alarming trend of enlarging existing, historic homes in this established neighborhood, irreversibly altering the character of the neighborhood and contributing to an increasingly unaffordable housing stock.

We appreciate your time and look forward to providing additional comments at your meeting next week.

Maribelle and Stephen Leavitt
415 563-1540
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, January 3, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES APPOINTMENT OF KATY MILLER AS CHIEF JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICER

Miller, who currently serves as Chief of Programs and Initiatives in the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, will bring experience working on juvenile and alternative justice programs to Juvenile Probation Department

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced the appointment of Katy Weinstein Miller to serve as Chief Juvenile Probation Officer for the City and County of San Francisco. Over the past two decades, Miller has worked to improve the criminal justice system as a community-based reformer and direct service provider, government policymaker and funder, and most recently, through her work in the District Attorney’s Office.

Working under the Mayoral-appointed Juvenile Probation Commission, the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer is responsible for leading the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD). JPD locates, develops, and administers programs for the assessment, education, treatment, appropriate rehabilitation, and effective supervision of youth under the jurisdiction of the Department.
“As we work to reform our juvenile justice system, it’s critical that we have a Chief Juvenile Probation Officer that is committed to keeping young people out of Juvenile Hall in the first place, providing rehabilitation with an equity lens for those who are in our custody, and ensuring youth get the support they need in order to break the cycle of the juvenile justice system,” said Mayor Breed. “Katy Miller’s experience, skills, and values make her an ideal leader for the Juvenile Probation Department. I’m looking forward to working with her to reform our juvenile justice system.”

“We are at a critical moment in San Francisco’s juvenile justice system. The historically low number of young people in our system affords us an unparalleled opportunity—and obligation—to re-examine our practices and create responses to delinquency grounded in positive youth development, equity and community well-being,” said Miller. “I’m grateful to Mayor Breed for entrusting me with the responsibility to lead San Francisco’s Juvenile Probation Department at this pivotal time. The challenges that confront us are urgent and complex, but we face them at a moment uniquely rich in hopeful solutions and collective will for change.”

Miller is currently the Chief of Programs and Initiatives in the District Attorney’s Office, a role that she has held since 2014. In that role, she leads policy and program development for the District Attorney’s juvenile and alternative justice programs and strategies. She oversaw the development, operation, and evaluation of Make it Right, a restorative justice diversion program for youths facing felony prosecution, and Young Adult Court, a nationally-recognized model for 18- to 25-year-olds charged with serious and violent felonies. She has previously held positions with Attorney General Kamala Harris’ transition team, as Director of Strategic Planning for Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, and in the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice for both Mayor Willie Brown and Mayor Gavin Newsom.

“Katy Miller will make an amazing Chief Probation Officer, and Mayor Breed could not have selected a better person for the job,” said Denise Coleman, Director of Youth Justice for Huckleberry Youth Programs, Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC). “I have worked with Katy for over twenty years and she consistently serves young people and their families with integrity, commitment, and passion. I am looking forward to seeing what she accomplishes in this new role.”

Mayor Breed is committed to reforming San Francisco’s juvenile justice system. In April 2019, Mayor Breed announced the formation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Blue Ribbon Panel, which is focusing on comprehensive and system-wide reform to San Francisco’s juvenile justice system. The Panel is charged with identifying systematic, implementable, and compassionate reforms to drastically reduce the number of youth detained in both Juvenile Hall and the State Division of Juvenile Justice. Miller is a member of the Panel.

Miller has a J.D. from Yale Law School and a B.A. from the University of Pennsylvania. She will begin serving as the Chief Probation Officer later this month.

###
Happy New Year! Here we go again…

Commissioners,
Attached are your Calendars for January 9, 2020.

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
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, January 3, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED RELEASES UPDATE TO FIVE-YEAR FINANCIAL PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

With revenue projected to grow at a slowing rate, 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 Joint Report Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2020-21 through 2023-24. The Joint Report, released by the offices of the Mayor, the Controller, and the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Legislative Analyst, projects that while the City will experience continued growth in tax revenues over the next four years, the cost of City services will outpace growth in tax revenues, resulting in ongoing structural deficits.

The projected deficit for the upcoming FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 budget represents a meaningfully higher deficit than the City has faced in the last two budget cycles. If the City does not take corrective action, the projected gap between revenues and expenditures will increase from a deficit of $195 million in FY 2020-21 to approximately $630 million by FY
The City’s budget deficit for the upcoming two fiscal years, FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22, is projected to be approximately $420 million.

“In order to provide the services that our residents depend on every day, we have to make fiscally responsible decisions for our City, and sometimes that means making tough trade-offs,” said Mayor Breed. “We need to be disciplined in our spending to ensure that what we spend doesn’t exceed what we bring in. We also have a crisis on our streets, so I’ve made it clear to Departments that we need to reprioritize existing funding to help people who are homeless and those who are suffering from mental illness and substance use disorder.”

The Joint Report Update projects that revenues will grow each year, but that they are not growing fast enough to keep pace with the projected increase in expenditures. As a result, a gap between revenue and expenditures will remain despite continued, but slowing, economic growth. Slowing growth is consistent with recent financial results, regional housing and infrastructure constraints, and the risk posed by the length of the current economic expansion. At 125 months, the 2008-2019 economic expansion is the longest in modern US history. Although the projections do not assume nor predict a recession, the persistent gap between revenue and expenditures would only be exacerbated in the event of the next economic slowdown or recession.

The Five-Year Financial Plan projects that available General Fund revenue sources will increase by $424 million, or 6.9%, over the next four years. In comparison, total expenditures are projected to grow by $1.1 billion, or 17.1%, over the same time period, including: $408 million in employee salary, pension, and benefit cost growth; $315 million in citywide operating cost increases; $163 million in baseline and reserve growth; and $169 million in other departmental operating cost increases.

The Mayor must submit a balanced two-year budget to the Board of Supervisors by June 1, 2020. Over the course of the next six months, the Mayor will work with City departments, the Board of Supervisors, and other partners to bring costs and revenues into alignment in order to balance the projected deficit for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22.

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.6(b) requires that by March 1 of each even-numbered year, the Mayor, Controller’s Office, and the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Legislative Analyst submit an updated estimated summary budget for the remaining four years of the City’s Five-Year Financial Plan. The next full update of the City’s Five-Year Financial Plan will be submitted in December 2020.

###
Hi,

I’m a resident of 468 Fell St in the Hayes Valley neighborhood right next to the proposed Mr C’s cannabis dispensary at 500 Laguna St. I walk by this store every single day and it is really unfortunate to have it sit idle and empty next to a bustling Urban Ritual and Il Borgo restaurant. I recently saw the Notice of Public Hearing and wanted to express my strong support of this development. Let me know if there is anything else I can do to help!

Thanks,
Lan Paje
Dear Commissioners:

I wanted to submit the following Public Comment for 542-550 Howard Street (Transbay Parcel F) regarding the Transit Center District Plan Policy 6.6:

**Policy 6.6** Require all major development to demonstrate that proposed heating and cooling systems have been designed in accordance with the following order of diminishing preference:

- Connection to sources of waste heat or underutilized boiler or CHP plant within the transit center district or adjacent areas
- Connection to existing district heating, cooling, and/or power plant or distribution networks with excess capacity
- Site-wide CHP powered by renewable energy
- Site-wide CHP powered by natural gas
- Building level communal heating and cooling powered by renewable energy
- Building level communal heating and cooling powered by natural gas
Clearway Energy owns and operates San Francisco’s over 100 year-old District Energy steam grid. In Policy 6.6 of the TCDP, building developers in this district are required to connect to our existing district heating grid if it is accessible. Our steam distribution line at 2nd and Howard is currently available for connection to Parcel F.

This is actually great news for the City as it “future proofs” new buildings that connect to our communal energy grid. As we migrate to carbon-free energy, everyone connected to our grid will immediately benefit. Many project developers hand responsibility for building energy designs to their engineering firm who simply install a permanent gas-burning water and space heating system. Engineering companies often tell the developer that District Energy Steam systems are old and inefficient. However, quite the opposite is true. New cities considering all energy options quickly realize that District Energy is their most efficient and sustainable choice. The SFPUC would certainly agree that our District Energy system is the best choice for new Transbay Transit Center buildings.

Parcel F building drawings currently show natural gas water and space heating systems. I want to be sure the developers of Parcel F will comply with the TCDP Policy to connect with District Energy steam, as they have not yet communicated with us. Can this energy policy be included for review at the January 9th public hearing?

Thank You,

Paul Lockareff
Director, Sales & Marketing
Clearway Energy, Inc.
Energy Center San Francisco
14 Mint Plaza, Suite 200, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-644-9666
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, December 30, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEMBERS ANNOUNCE FUNDING PLAN FOR CITY COLLEGE CLASSES FOR OLDER ADULTS AND ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES

Funding through the Dignity Fund will continue classes in CCSF’s Older Adults Program that take place at San Francisco community centers, which were at risk as part of CCSF’s plan to address operating deficits

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London Breed, Board President Norman Yee, and Supervisors Catherine Stefani, Ahsha Safai, Aaron Peskin, and Rafael Mandelman today announced a plan to fund classes for older adults and adults with disabilities that were at risk of being cut as part of City College of San Francisco’s (CCSF) efforts to address ongoing operating deficits.

The plan will allow classes in CCSF’s Older Adults Program (OLAD) to continue by using resources from the Dignity Fund to leverage existing contracts with community-based
organizations in order to continue 17 classes at 13 sites, which serves approximately 1,000 participants. Course activities include physical fitness, wellness, nutrition, language arts, art, and music appreciation. The anticipated annual cost of the classes is $216,000.

The Dignity Fund was passed by voters in 2016 and guarantees funding to enhance supportive services to help older adults and adults with disabilities age with dignity in their own homes and communities. The Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS), which administers the Dignity Fund, is able to dedicate these resources for at least the next three years.

“City College is having to make some tough choices to address ongoing structural financial issues, and while that is happening we can lessen the impact for our seniors who visit our community centers to enrich their lives,” said Mayor Breed. “Many of our older adults rely on these classes, which keep them active and connected to the community, and I’m glad we’re able to find a way to ensure that they can continue.”

Using available Dignity Fund revenue, DAS will provide funding to community-based organizations that currently host OLAD classes in order to allow them to continue. These courses are currently offered at senior and community centers throughout San Francisco. The organizations will assume responsibility for administering the classes from CCSF, including securing instructors, supervising curriculum, and managing student enrollment. The City will continue to explore other options for supplementing existing programs that serve the community.

“When we created the Dignity Fund, it was with the very intention to secure long-term funding to serve our seniors with quality programs. With the senior population on the rise, San Francisco cannot afford losing the limited services we have for our aging adults. I am proud that we are able to develop a collaborative approach leveraging existing resources and partnering with our community partners to bring their expertise in ensuring that these pivotal educational and recreational courses can continue serving residents throughout the city,” stated Supervisor Norman Yee, President of the Board of Supervisors.

For over 20 years, non-profit organizations in San Francisco have partnered with CCSF to provide educational classes for older adults at community service centers throughout the City. Many participants are low-income and speak languages other than English. These courses supplement traditional senior center activities and services, including congregate meal and case management services funded by DAS.

“We are so pleased to be able to continue these classes for older adults that are so vital to so many,” stated Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director of the Department of Disability and Aging Services. “Not only are older adults San Francisco’s fastest growing age group, but they are living longer lives with more opportunities to remain engaged and active. These classes help keep older residents involved in their community, but also benefit our City as well, by allowing us to draw on their experience, insight and knowledge.”

To learn more about OLAD course offerings and to register, contact participating senior and community centers. Additional information on wellness and community engagement classes for older adults and adults with disabilities in San Francisco is available by calling the DAS Benefits and Resources Hub at (415) 355-6700.

CCSF OLAD courses will continue by leveraging Dignity Fund resources at the following
locations:

- 30th Street Senior Center (On Lok)
- Aquatic Park Senior Center
- Castro Senior Center
- Jewish Community Center
- Self-Help for the Elderly Senior Centers: Geen Mun, Jackie Chan, South Sunset, John King, West Portal Clubhouse
- Stepping Stone Adult Day Health Centers: Mabini, Mission Creek, Presentation
- YMCA Stonestown

###
From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: Multi-Factor Authentication required for Office 365, starting Jan 2020
Date: Monday, December 23, 2019 9:07:45 AM
Attachments: (SMS) Setting up MFA in Office 365.docx
(App) Setting up MFA in Office 365.docx
(Phone Call) Setting up MFA in Office 365.docx
image001.png

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: Yoshikawa, Genta (CPC) <genta.yoshikawa@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2019 5:33 PM
To: Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Black, Kate (CPC) <kate.black@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; So, Lydia (CPC) <lydia.so@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Wong, Barry (CPC) <barry.w.wong@sfgov.org>
Subject: Multi-Factor Authentication required for Office 365, starting Jan 2020

Dear SF Planning Commissioners,

I’m Genta Yoshikawa with SF Planning IT Help Desk.
I’m writing to notify you of a new IT security policy that will impact your Office365 user accounts (SFGOV email).

City recently announced a new IT security policy where all CCSF users will be required to enroll their Office365 accounts with multi-factor authentication (MFA) by January 21, 2020.

MFA is a security step that helps protect your account by making it harder for others to break in. It uses two different forms of identification: your password and a contact method such as a mobile phone. Even in an event when someone acquires your password, this person won’t be able to access your account without an access to your secondary contact method (your mobile phone).
MFA will be enabled for your account on January 21, 2020 by default. Or, you are more than welcome to request for an early activation.
Once MFA is enabled, you will be required to go through an initial setup process before you can access your SFGOV mailbox.

Attached to this email are step by step instructions for three contact methods you can choose from:
   1. Authenticator App
   2. SMS Text
   3. Phone Call

Please contact Barry or Genta at City Planning Help Desk if you have any question or need an assistance.

Barry Wong  | Barry.W.Wong@sfgov.org  | 415-575-8759
Genta Yoshikawa  | Genta.Yoshikawa@sfgov.org  | 415-558-6269 (out of office between 1/16 – 1/21/2020)

Thank you,

Genta Yoshikawa
IS Administrator
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.558.6269 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: DT Communications <noreply@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Yoshikawa, Genta (CPC) <genta.yoshikawa@sfgov.org>
Subject: Multi-Factor Authentication required for Office 365, starting Jan 2020
Office 365 Multi-Factor Authentication

January 21, 2020

In response to the rise in sophisticated phishing, spear phishing, and malware attacks that are targeting our staff, all CCSF users will be required to enroll their Office 365 accounts with multi-factor authentication (MFA) by January 21, 2020.

MFA is an additional security step that helps protect user accounts by making it harder for bad actors to log in using another's username and password. It uses two different forms of identification: a user's password plus a contact method such as a mobile device or desk phone. Even if someone obtains a user's password, they will be unable to log in to the user's account without ID verification from their second contact method.

A user's identity can be verified using:

- One-time SMS code to a mobile device
- Automated phone call to number of a user's choosing
- Authenticator app on a mobile device

Action Items

IT Administrators should review the Office 365 MFA Administration Guide for information about application compatibility and instructions for
enabling user enrollment.

Additionally, end-users should be notified of the upcoming change and provided instructions to complete enrollment. More information and enrollment guides can be found in the Office 365 Multi-Factor Authentication site.

To minimize the potential impact of support calls to your Service Desk, we recommend testing and enabling MFA for users in groups before January 21, 2020. If you would like help planning and scheduling this rollout, please contact the Department of Technology Service Desk.

Questions?
If you have any questions, please contact the Department of Technology Service desk at dtis.helpdesk@sfgov.org.

- Join the conversation in the O365 Admins Team
- Learn more at the DT Service Desk SharePoint site

This email has been sent to members of the Office 365 Administrators group for the City and County of San Francisco.

Copyright © 2018 City & County of San Francisco, Department of Technology, All rights reserved.

Support:
(628) 652-5000
datis.helpdesk@sfgov.org

City & County of San Francisco, Department of Technology
1 South Van Ness 2nd floor San Francisco, California 94103 USA
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, December 23, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** MEDIA ADVISORY ***
MAYOR LONDON N. BREED’S SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC EVENTS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2019

3:00 PM
Mayor London Breed to join the San Francisco Police Department, Project LEVEL, the Steezzy Cares Kids Foundation, and community members for the 2nd Annual Fillmore Christmas Tree Giveaway.
Fillmore/Turk Mini Park

Note: Mayor’s schedule is subject to change.

###
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: Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2019 2:12 PM
To: Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: SF Office Development Annual Limitation Program - Update

All Interested Parties,

The SF Office Development Annual Limitation Program tracking sheet sent out earlier today contained some errors. Those errors were corrected, and the updated tracking sheet is attached. It will be available on our website shortly (https://sfplanning.org/office-development-annual-limitation-program). Please let me know if you have any questions.

Corey A. Teague, AICP, LEED AP
Zoning Administrator

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9081 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: Teague, Corey (CPC)
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2019 12:27 PM
To: Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Office Development Annual Limitation Program - Update

All Interested Parties,

The SF Office Development Annual Limitation Program tracking sheet, as of December 20, 2019, is attached. It will be available on our website shortly (https://sfplanning.org/office-development-annual-limitation-program). Please let me know if you have any questions.

Corey A. Teague, AICP, LEED AP
Zoning Administrator
Commissioners,
I am pleased to forward your Cancellation Notice for December 26, 2019 and January 2, 2020.

Congratulations on a very productive year in 2019.

Looking forward to 2020.

Enjoy your Holidays and have a happy New Year!

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:
Friday, December 20, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES NEW RENTAL SUBSIDIES FOR HIV POSITIVE SAN FRANCISCANS

$1 million in funding from the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development for first new HIV rental subsidies in 12 years; Q Foundation now accepting applications for the program

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced the launch of the first new rental subsidy program for people living with HIV/AIDS in 12 years. In partnership with Mayor Breed and the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), the Q Foundation hosted a launch event today at the Main Library for people to receive information about the program, including qualification criteria and the application process.

Last month, MOHCD awarded $1 million to the Q Foundation to administer the HIV/AIDS Rent Subsidy Program. Mayor Breed included the funding for the program in the City budget. In addition to these new subsidies, the City has long provided rental subsidies for people living with HIV and AIDS through the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) Program.
“As we work to end homelessness in our City, we must also work to keep people housed, and this program helps us do just that,” said Mayor Breed. “Although we’ve reached a record-low number of new HIV infections in San Francisco, disparities exist among populations—including people who are unstably housed. These rental subsidies help people who have HIV live in stable, safe conditions, so they can continue to seek treatment and just live their lives without worrying about their housing situation.”

“On behalf of Q Foundation and the HIV+ communities, we are proud and thankful for the leadership of Mayor London Breed and the City in taking this important step to reduce homelessness,” said Brian Basinger, Co-Founder and Executive Director of Q Foundation. “There are currently 2,390 people with HIV in San Francisco with immediate need for housing assistance. This investment in equity provides hope for our HIV+ communities who are among the top five highest rates of homelessness in the City.”

Following the information session, case managers from the Q Foundation walked people through the application process using the Library’s computer lab. This immediate screening for eligibility will allow Q Foundation staff to begin reviewing applications as soon as possible. The rental subsidies will be administered to approximately 120 individuals who are HIV positive. To qualify for the program, people must be either currently housed and paying more than 70 percent of their income toward rent, or offered below-market rate housing in San Francisco, but in need of a subsidy.

“There is an immense need for rental subsidies for individuals who are HIV positive living in San Francisco, the city with one of the highest rates of HIV positive people experiencing homelessness in the United States,” said Daniel Adams, Acting Director of MOHCD. “We are excited to partner with the Q Foundation to administer these subsidies to ensure those with HIV/AIDS can live with dignity and security.”

In 2014, San Francisco City agencies and organizations came together in a collective impact initiative known as Getting to Zero. This initiative brings together people and resources from throughout the city with three goals in mind: zero new HIV infections, zero HIV-related deaths and zero stigma and discrimination.

Helping HIV positive individuals remain housed or find housing advances the City’s goal of “getting to zero” new HIV infections and HIV-related deaths. Stable housing allows people to more easily access the regular health care and medications they need to achieve viral suppression. Viral suppression drugs have made HIV a survivable disease for many, but there is a major disparity when it comes to people who are marginally housed or homeless. Thirty-three percent of homeless persons living with HIV in San Francisco are virally suppressed, compared to 74 percent of housed persons.

In the 2018 Annual HIV Epidemiology Report, which was released this September, the Department of Public Health found that the total number of new HIV diagnoses fell below 200 for the first time. However, the number of new HIV diagnoses increased among people experiencing homelessness, further demonstrating the need for programs that help people become housed and remain in their homes.

In addition to the rental subsidy program for HIV-positive people, the City has a wide portfolio of rental and housing subsidies for low-income trans people, seniors, people with
disabilities, and formerly homeless individuals living in permanent supportive housing. The City budget for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 includes $2 million in new subsidies for trans individuals and $300,000 for trans housing stability case management, and is projected to serve at least 55 households. The budget also includes $7 million in new funding for housing subsidies for low-income seniors and people with disabilities, including $500,000 that the Q Foundation is also administering. These investments will prevent eviction and stabilize tenancies for some of the City’s most vulnerable residents.

Q Foundation aims to prevent homelessness by protecting the housing people already have, providing resources to secure new housing, and promoting public policy to expand opportunities for all. Q Foundation provides rental subsidies and affordable housing application assistance to diverse community of San Francisco, specifically including LGBTQ, HIV+, seniors, disabled adults, and families.

Individuals interested in applying for the rental subsidies should talk to their case manager, or use Q Foundation’s online self-referral tool at https://theqfoundation.org/signup.
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: Hannah Fenton <hannah.e.fenton@gmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2019 11:47 AM  
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Office of Cannabis (ADM) <officeofcannabis@sfgov.org>; angel <brokenspectacles@gmail.com>; Nguey Lay <ngueylay@msn.com>; mike.hall.tennis@gmail.com  
Subject: Letter of Support for 415 Native LLC at 313 Ivy St

12/20/19

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to show support for 415 Native LLC, a cannabis equity applicant group applying for a conditional use to open up a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street, San Francisco, California 94114. I have known the applicants for a very long time and are familiar with their business practices and commitment to the community.

Owners Mike, Nguey and Angel care about the community they are in and conduct business in an upstanding and respectable manner. They have been given the opportunity to open a cannabis retail location at 313 Ivy Street through the Equity Program, a program designed by the city of San Francisco to foster the equitable participation in the cannabis industry and to help create business opportunities for those negatively impacted by the war on drugs. Mike, is an equity business owner and longstanding member of the community who runs a youth tennis program and works in cannabis advocacy. Nguey and Angel, owners of the Fig and Thistle Market and Wine Bar have been working in small business for over 6 years now in both the
food and beverage industry as well as the cannabis industry. They have been friends for over 20 years and are all from the city, together you have a group of people that have already proven their commitment to creating a space both welcomed by the neighborhood and customers alike and dedication to the community and to the betterment of the city. Stay Gold has the ability to provide the same positive impact that their previous projects have delivered.

It is my opinion that this cannabis dispensary will be an asset to the community and I want to support their efforts to provide a safe and welcoming space for cannabis access and education. Please help keep San Francisco special and commerce local by allowing small businesses like this one to operate and thrive in the community.

Peace,

Hannah E. Fenton
hannah.e.fenton@gmail.com
San Francisco, CA
(209) 404-7154
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, December 19, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES OPENING OF LA CASA DE LAS MADRES DROP IN COUNSELING CENTER

New center at 1269 Howard Street to expand support for survivors of domestic violence

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and La Casa de las Madres, San Francisco’s leading provider of domestic violence response and prevention services, today celebrated the opening of a new Drop in Counseling Center for survivors of domestic violence. Over the past 20 years, La Casa’s Drop in Center has moved three times, as the program grew and needed more space. This acquisition, supported by a grant from the Office of Economic and Workforce Development’s Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative, provides La Casa with a permanent home and an additional 3,000 square feet of space to accommodate their domestic violence support services.

“Each year I hear from nonprofits like La Casa de las Madres whose high rents put their services at risk. With support from my Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative, organizations helping women, children and other vulnerable people have secured more than 100,000 square feet of newly nonprofit-owned space to ensure access to their services for years to come,” said Mayor Breed. “La Casa de las Madres is ending the cycle of domestic violence through crisis
response, support services and prevention, and I’m glad the City is able to support them so they can continue their important work.”

La Casa de las Madres is one of four nonprofits to receive the highest possible award of $1 million, allowing them to overcome the high costs of real estate and grow their operations and services for women and children affected by domestic violence. Community Vision administers the awards through a competitive request for proposals.

“With rents continuing to rise in San Francisco, having the space to support the thousands of survivors of domestic violence each year was becoming increasingly difficult. The City’s support is truly transformational,” said Kathy Black, La Casa’s Executive Director. “We want all survivors to both believe in and actualize a life free from fear and abuse. With the help of the Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative, survivors and their children will always have a safe place to turn when they need it most.”

La Casa’s services have expanded in the last five years, adding partnerships with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, the Bayview Police Station, and the Human Services Agency to their comprehensive domestic violence response and prevention services. In addition to these more recent partnerships, La Casa operates a 24-hour emergency shelter, two crisis lines, a text line, and has advocates co-located at the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Police Department Special Victims Unit, the Mary Elizabeth Inn, and select San Francisco Unified School District high schools. A diverse network of public and private funding supports these services.

“La Casa de las Madres provides a crucial lifeline to survivors of domestic violence, especially immigrant women, and helps them navigate the challenging process of securing their independence and safe housing,” said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. “We are proud to support this acquisition that enables La Casa to stay rooted in the community they serve and provide more life-saving services to survivors escaping the cycle of domestic violence.”

La Casa aims to reach over 3,000 adult and child survivors of domestic violence each year. While the organization shelters nearly 400 individuals on an annual basis, the majority of their clients are participating in programs run through their Drop in Counseling Center. Increasing the size of this space allows for more support groups, peer counseling and one-on-one therapeutic support. La Casa’s new Center also has a large space for training volunteers and other service providers who work with survivors.

“We want as many people as possible to be able to recognize the warning signs of domestic violence, and know how to refer a victim or survivor to support services like La Casa. Training other community based service providers and volunteers to see, the signs, and provide the right referrals, means that an individual is more likely to get out of an unsafe or abusive situation sooner,” Black explained.

La Casa’s goal is to decrease the rate of domestic violence in San Francisco. Domestic violence affects one in four women each year and is leading cause of homelessness and economic instability for women in the City. In addition to serving survivors of domestic violence, La Casa works to avert domestic violence-related crises before they happen and before the survivor loses their housing, their job, or their health and well-being.
About La Casa de las Madres
La Casa de las Madres provides expert domestic violence intervention and prevention services to more than 20,000 San Francisco community members each year. In addition to a 35-bed confidentially located emergency shelter, La Casa’s services include an active Drop in Center, 24-hour Teen and Adult Hotlines, La Casa’s Teen Program, and community education and outreach. All services are free of charge, multilingual, confidential, and available to all victims of domestic violence. For more information about La Casa de las Madres, visit www.lacasa.org.

About the Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative
The Nonprofit Sustainability Initiative is led by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development in partnership with the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, the San Francisco Arts Commission, and Community Vision to deploy a variety of tools to help stabilize nonprofits.

Since 2017, the program has awarded $9.3 million and assisted more than 100 San Francisco-based nonprofits. Information about the initiative and current resources for nonprofits may be found at www.oewd.org/nonprofits.

###
January 8, 2020

Stephanie Cushing, Director of Environmental Health
San Francisco Department of Public Health
Environmental Health Services
Local Oversight Program
1390 Market Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102
stephanie.cushing@sfdph.org

RE: 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, CA (2018-011430CUA)
Opposition to Closure, Request for Hearing

Dear Ms. Cushing and Department of Public Health:

I am writing on behalf of The Hollow Revolution ("THoR"), an association of neighbors living near 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California, concerning the proposal to grant "closure" status to the contaminated site located at 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California ("Site"). THoR opposes site closure, and requests a public hearing on the matter. As discussed in the attached letter from certified hydrogeologist, Matthew Hagemann, C. Hg., (Exhibit A), "the property at 1776 Green Street is not suitable for closure" due to the presence of the cancer-causing chemical benzene at levels far above residential standards, and even exceeding commercial standards. Since further remedial action is required, site closure is inappropriate.

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND

1776 Green Street was used as an automotive repair garage for over one hundred years, from 1914 to 2018. During much of that time, almost no environmental laws even existed. The site became heavily contaminated with the cancer-causing chemical, benzene, which apparently leaked from several underground storage tanks.

A private developer is now proposing to convert the property to residential use with six luxury units and a two-story addition ("Project"). The Project will involve excavation of approximately 1300 cubic yards of potentially contaminated soil to expand the below-ground parking garage.

On December 3, 2019, Mamdouh Awwad of the San Francisco Department of Public Health ("SFDPH"), Environmental Health Branch, posted a report on the Cortese List's GeoTracker website, recommending that the site be deemed "eligible for closure." SFDPH is the Local Oversight Program ("LOP") for contaminated site clean-ups. On
December 9, 2019, SFDPH posted a Notice of Intent to close local oversight program case for 1776 Green Street, requesting comments or requests for hearing by January 9, 2020.

The most obvious problem with the proposal to close the Site is that it ignores entirely the obvious fact that the use of the Site will be changing to residential rather than commercial use, and additional clean-up is admittedly required for the new use since the Site fails to meet residential clean-up standards. Furthermore, as discussed below, if SFDPH takes discretionary action to close the Site, it must first conduct review under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). Pub. Res. Code 21084(c).

B. SITE CLOSURE IS IMPROPER.

1. Legal Requirements.

Pursuant to the Health and Safety Code, site closure is only allowed when “no further corrective action is required at the site.” Health & Saf. §25299.3. Similarly, the Water Board’s guidance document entitled, GeoTracker Status Definitions states that a sites is “Open – Eligible for Closure” only when “Corrective action at the Site has been determined to be completed.” (Exhibit B). State Water Board Resolution 92-49 “directs that water affected by an unauthorized release attain either background water quality or the best water quality that is reasonable if background water quality cannot be restored.” The Low-Treat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (“LTUST Policy”) (Exhibit C) requires that the “Secondary source [of pollution] has been removed to the extent practicable.” (LTUST Policy, p. 3). Any “alternate level of water quality” must not “exceed that prescribed in the applicable Basin Plan.” (LTUST Policy, p. 6). “Secondary source” is defined as:

petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Unless site attributes prevent secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist whose removal or relocation would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release sites are required to undergo secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described herein. “To the extent practicable” means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which removes or destroys-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. It is expected that most secondary mass removal efforts will be completed in one year or less. Following removal or destruction of the secondary source, additional removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulatory agencies unless (1) necessary to abate a demonstrated threat to human health or (2) the groundwater plume does not meet the definition of low threat as described in this policy. (LTUST Policy, p. 4).

Pursuant to the Water code, the agency must consider “reasonable maximum estimates of exposure for both current land use conditions and reasonably foreseeable future land uses at the site.” Water Code §13304.2(c)(6) (emphasis added). Similarly, the LTUST Policy requires analysis of site specific conditions “under current and
reasonably anticipated near-term future scenarios." (LTUST Policy, p. 6 (emphasis added)).

Finally, the Low-Treat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy ("LTUST Policy") requires a "60 day period to comment" on any proposed case closure. (LTUST Policy, p.9).

2. Site is Not Eligible for Closure Under the Applicable Legal Standards.

The SFDPH Case Closure Summary only recommends closure of the site for the "current land use." (Case Closure Summary, Section IV). The "current use" is listed as "commercial." (Id. Section III). The report expressly states that if the land use changes, (such as to residential use), then further corrective action may be required. (Id. Section IV). The report states that additional site clean-up is required: "The development will require additional site assessment and a Site Mitigation Plan prior to development." (Id. Section VII).

Despite clean-up efforts dating to 2016, the report clearly shows that soil contamination have not improved at all (although groundwater contamination levels have improved). (Id. Section III, p.2). These contamination levels remain far above Environmental Screening Levels ("ESLs"). (Id. Section VII).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contaminant</th>
<th>Soil (ppm)</th>
<th>Water (ppb)</th>
<th>Contaminant</th>
<th>Soil (ppm)</th>
<th>Water (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPH (Gas)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPH (Diesel)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: TPH-b,p</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylene</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPHTHALENE</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed by certified hydrogeologist Matthew Hagemann, The "after" benzene levels that remain in soil and groundwater, as tabulated above, exceed the following San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) below:

- Benzene (groundwater): 0.42 ppb (residential soil vapor intrusion concerns)
- Benzene (groundwater): 1.8 ppb (commercial/industrial soil vapor intrusion concerns)
- Benzene (soil): 0.33 ppm (residential exposure)
- Benzene (soil): 1.4 ppm (commercial/industrial exposure)
• Benzene (soil): 33 ppm (construction worker exposure)

To put this in perspective, the current levels in soil and groundwater exceed state standards by hundreds of times. The current level of Benzene in groundwater of 380 ppb exceeds the residential ESL of 0.42 ppb by 904 times. Furthermore, it exceeds even the commercial of 1.8 ppb ESL by 211 times. The benzene level in soil of 94 ppm at the Site exceeds the residential ESL of 0.33 ppm by over one hundred times, and also exceeds the commercial ESL of 1.4 ppm by 67 times. Benzene is a known human carcinogen. Mr. Hagemann concludes that these levels pose potential risks related to soil vapor intrusion and construction worker exposure. Soil-vapor intrusion is a process in which the chemical vapors may enter the new construction above, potentially exposing future residents.

It appears that the SFDPH has ignored entirely the fact that the Site is proposed to be converted to residential use. However, the Planning Commission is currently considering an application for permits to convert the automobile repair shop to a six-unit residential development. This is clearly “reasonably foreseeable future land use at the site” within the meaning of Water Code §13304.2(c)(6).

SFDPH’s own report admits that if the land use changes, (such as to residential use), then further corrective action may be required. (Id. Section IV). The report states that additional Site clean-up is required: “The development will require additional site assessment and a Site Mitigation Plan prior to development.” (Id. Section VII). SFDPH’s own report establishes that further corrective action is required for residential use. Therefore, the City cannot make a finding that “no further corrective action is required at the site.” Health & Saf. §25299.3. Nor can the City make a finding that when “Corrective action at the Site has been determined to be completed.” (GeoTracker Status Definitions).

For the foregoing reasons, SFDPH may not make a finding that the Site is eligible for closure. It should promptly reverse this finding pending full remediation of the Site to residential standards.

Finally, the LTUST Policy requires a “60 day period to comment” on any proposed case closure. (LTUST Policy, p.9). SFDPH has provided only a 31-day comment period. The Notice of Intent to Close Local Oversight of 1776 Green was posted on December 9, 2019, and stated that any comments must be provided on or before January 9, 2020. This provided only 31 days comment period – including the Christmas/New Year holiday. This flatly violates the LTUST Policy and deprived the interested public of an adequate opportunity to review and comment on the decision.

C. CEQA REVIEW IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO SITE CLOSURE.

The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) provides that any “project” located on the State of California’s Cortese List of highly contaminated sites may not be exempted from CEQA review. CEQA is quite clear, a categorical exemption:
"shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code [Cortese List]."

14 CCR §15300.2(e) (emphasis added). The CEQA statute states:

"No project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code [Cortese List] shall be exempted from this division pursuant to subdivision (a)[categorical exemptions]."

PRC § 21084(c)). There is no question that the Site is on the Cortese list.

CEQA only applies to "discretionary" actions. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080(a), (b)(1); Guideline § 15268(a)). The decision of whether to list the Site as "closed" on the Cortese list is clearly a "discretionary" action, and therefore falls under CEQA. Closing the Site may have significant adverse environmental impacts since it may bring a halt to ongoing clean-up activities that are necessary to protect human health and the environment.

The decision to list the Site as "closed" is the first step in a series of actions intended to allow the Site to be developed for the pending six-unit residential Project. As such, the City may not "piecemeal" that decision from the consideration of the Project itself. Under CEQA, the agency must consider the "whole of an action." 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15378(a). That means:

"[T]he environmental review accompanying the first discretionary approval must evaluate the impacts of the ultimate development authorized by that approval. ... Even though further discretionary approvals may be required before development can occur, the agency’s environmental review must extend to the development envisioned by the initial approvals. It is irrelevant that the development may not receive all necessary entitlements or may not be built. Piecemeal environmental review that ignores the environmental impacts of the end result will not be permitted."

See Kostka, et al., Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act, § 6.52, p. 298. As the Court of Appeal stated:

"The CEQA process is intended to be a careful examination, fully open to the public, of the environmental consequences of a given project, covering the entire project, from start to finish. ... the purpose of CEQA is not to generate paper, but to compel government at all levels to make decisions with environmental consequences in mind."


SFDPH has violated CEQA by failing to perform any CEQA review of its proposed action to "close" the Site on the Cortese list. SF DPH has "piecemealed" this action from consideration of the known fact that the Site is proposed to be converted from commercial
to residential use, and has failed entirely to consider the six-unit Project underlying all of these actions. There is no question that “development in the near future was anticipated.” Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com., 13 Cal. 3d 263, 281 (1975). This action is intended to facilitate the proposed development of a specific residential Project on the Site. “[B]efore conducting CEQA review, agencies must not ‘take any action’ that significantly furthers a project ‘in a manner that forecloses alternatives or mitigation measures that would ordinarily be part of CEQA review of that public project.’” (Cal.Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15004, subd. (b)(2)(B).) Save Tara v. City of W. Hollywood, 45 Cal.4th 116, 138 (2008).

Under these circumstances, CEQA requires that the Project may not be exempted from CEQA review. CEQA review is required to develop a clean-up plan, subjected to public review, to ensure safe and adequate site clean-up that adequately protects neighbors, workers and future residents of the Project. (CEQA section 21084(c); Citizens for Responsible Equitable Env’t Dev. v. City of Chula Vista (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 327, 331-333).

Therefore, if SFDPH intends to “close” the Site on the Cortese List, it must first conduct CEQA review to analyze the environmental impacts of its action, to analyze the proposed Project, and to consider feasible mitigation measures and alternatives.

D. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we request that SFDPH not list the property at 1776 Green as “closed” or “eligible for closure” on the Cortese list, and remove any such references from the GeoTracker database. We request a public hearing on the proposed decision. We also request that SFDPH conduct CEQA review of the proposed discretionary action.

Sincerely,

Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

Cc: San Francisco Planning Commission
c/o Jonas Ionin (jonas.ionin@sfgov.org; commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
EXHIBIT A
January 7, 2020

Stephanie K.J. Cushing, MSPH, CHMM, REHS  
Department of Public Health  
Environmental Health Services  
Local Oversight Program  
City and County of San Francisco  
1390 Market Street, Suite 210  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California

Dear Ms. Cushing:

I am commenting on the “Eligible for Closure” notice posted for 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California. Because of residual soil and groundwater contamination, it is my opinion that the property at 1776 Green Street is not suitable for closure.

Residential development, to include a four-story building atop a one-level below-grade parking garage, is proposed for this property. The proposed project site was used for automotive repair purposes between 1914 and 2018.¹

A Case Closure Summary, signed on December 3, 2019 (attached), prepared by the San Francisco Department of Public Health for 1776 Green Street includes this summary table on page 2.

¹ Phase II Site Investigation Workplan, 1176 Green Street, San Francisco, AllWest Environmental, January 18, 2019
The “after” benzene levels that remain in soil and groundwater, as tabulated above, exceed the following San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) below:

- Benzene (groundwater): 0.42 ppb (residential soil vapor intrusion concerns)
- Benzene (groundwater): 1.8 ppb (commercial/industrial soil vapor intrusion concerns)
- Benzene (soil): 0.33 ppm (residential exposure)
- Benzene (soil): 1.4 ppm (commercial/industrial exposure)
- Benzene (soil): 33 ppm (construction worker exposure)

I have noted that the December 3, 2019 Case Closure Summary states that the corrective action taken at the site is protective only of the current land use, i.e., commercial (p. 1). The Case Closure Summary further states “Most sensitive current use: Commercial” (p. 2). The Case Closure Summary does not acknowledge the proposed change in the current commercial land use to residential; therefore, the lower concentration residential ESLs are most applicable for comparison even though commercial/industrial ESLs for benzene in soil and groundwater are also greatly exceeded.

The “after” benzene concentrations in soil and groundwater greatly exceed residential (and commercial/industrial) ESLs, indicating further investigation or mitigation, including consideration of the installation of a barrier or membrane to reduce the vapor intrusion potential. Benzene is a known human carcinogen\(^2\) and the remaining (“after”) levels of benzene may pose health risks to construction workers, commercial/industrial workers and future residents.

The Case Closure Summary states that oversight is to be continued under the Site Mitigation Program (Article 22A) of local Health Code and that development will require additional site assessment and a Site Mitigation Plan under Article 22A (p. 3). Closure is only appropriate when no further action is required. Therefore, because of the proposed residential development, the site should be further assessed and mitigated (as appropriate) prior to closure.

\(^2\) [https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxFAQs/tfacts3.pdf](https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxFAQs/tfacts3.pdf)
Sincerely,

Matt Hagemann, P.G., C.Hg.
EXHIBIT B
Project Status Definitions

1. Completed — Case Closed
   A closure letter or other formal closure decision document has been issued for the site.

2. Open — Assessment & Interim Remedial Action
   An “interim” remedial action is occurring at the site AND additional activities such as site characterization, investigation, risk evaluation, and/or site conceptual model development are occurring.

3. Open — Inactive
   No regulatory oversight activities are being conducted by the Lead Agency.

4. Open — Remediation
   An approved remedy or remedies has/have been selected for the impacted media at the site and the responsible party (RP) is implementing one or more remedy under an approved cleanup plan for the site. This includes any ongoing remedy that is either passive or active, or uses a combination of technologies. For example, a site implementing only a long term groundwater monitoring program, or a “monitored natural attenuation” (MNA) remedy without any active groundwater treatment as part of the remedy, is considered an open case under remediation until site closure is completed.

5. Open — Site Assessment
   Site characterization, investigation, risk evaluation, and/or site conceptual model development are occurring at the site. Examples of site assessment activities include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) identification of the contaminants and the investigation of their potential impacts; 2) determination of the threats/impacts to water quality; 3) evaluation of the risk to humans and ecology; 4) delineation of the nature and extent of contamination; 5) delineation of the contaminant plume(s); and 6) development of the Site Conceptual Model.

6. Open — Verification Monitoring (use only for UST, Chapter 16 regulated cases)
   Remediation phases are essentially complete and a monitoring/sampling program is occurring to confirm successful completion of cleanup at the Site. (e.g. No “active” remediation is considered necessary or no additional “active” remediation is anticipated as needed. Active remediation system(s) has/have been shut-off and the potential for a rebound in contaminant concentrations is under evaluation).

7. Open — Reopen Case (available selection only for previously closed cases)
   This is not a case status. This field should be selected to record the date that the case was reopened for further investigation and/or remediation. A case status should immediately be selected from the list of case status choices after recording this date.

8. Open — Eligible for Closure
   Corrective action at the Site has been determined to be completed and any remaining petroleum constituents from the release are considered to be low threat to Human Health, Safety, and the Environment. The case in GeoTracker is going through the process of being closed.
Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy

Preamble
The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) administers the petroleum UST (Underground Storage Tank) Cleanup Program, which was enacted by the Legislature in 1984 to protect health, safety and the environment. The State Water Board also administers the petroleum UST Cleanup Fund (Fund), which was enacted by the Legislature in 1989 to assist UST owners and operators in meeting federal financial responsibility requirements and to provide reimbursement to those owners and operators for the high cost of cleaning up unauthorized releases caused by leaking USTs.

The State Water Board believes it is in the best interest of the people of the State that unauthorized releases be prevented and cleaned up to the extent practicable in a manner that protects human health, safety and the environment. The State Water Board also recognizes that the technical and economic resources available for environmental restoration are limited, and that the highest priority for these resources must be the protection of human health and environmental receptors. Program experience has demonstrated the ability of remedial technologies to mitigate a substantial fraction of a petroleum contaminant mass with the investment of a reasonable level of effort. Experience has also shown that residual contaminant mass usually remains after the investment of reasonable effort, and that this mass is difficult to completely remove regardless of the level of additional effort and resources invested.

It has been well-documented in the literature and through experience at individual UST release sites that petroleum fuels naturally attenuate in the environment through adsorption, dispersion, dilution, volatilization, and biological degradation. This natural attenuation slows and limits the migration of dissolved petroleum plumes in groundwater. The biodegradation of petroleum, in particular, distinguishes petroleum products from other hazardous substances commonly found at commercial and industrial sites.

The characteristics of UST releases and the California UST Program have been studied extensively, with individual works including:

b. SB1764 Committee report (1996)
c. UST Cleanup Program Task Force report (2010)
e. Cleanup Fund audit (2010)
f. State Water Resources Control Board site closure orders
g. State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 2009-0081

In general, these efforts have recognized that many petroleum release cases pose a low threat to human health and the environment. Some of these studies also recommended establishing "low-threat" closure criteria in order to maximize the benefits to the people of the State of California through judicious application of available resources.
The purpose of this policy is to establish consistent statewide case closure criteria for low-threat petroleum UST sites. The policy is consistent with existing statutes, regulations, State Water Board precedential decisions, policies and resolutions, and is intended to provide clear direction to responsible parties, their service providers, and regulatory agencies. The policy seeks to increase UST cleanup process efficiency. A benefit of improved efficiency is the preservation of limited resources for mitigation of releases posing a greater threat to human and environmental health.

This policy is based in part upon the knowledge and experience gained from the last 25 years of investigating and remediating unauthorized releases of petroleum from USTs. While this policy does not specifically address other petroleum release scenarios such as pipelines or above ground storage tanks, if a particular site with a different petroleum release scenario exhibits attributes similar to those which this policy addresses, the criteria for closure evaluation of these non-UST sites should be similar to those in this policy.

This policy is a state policy for water quality control and applies to all petroleum UST sites subject to Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and Chapter 16 of Division 3 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations. The term “regulatory agencies” in this policy means the State Water Board, Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) and local agencies authorized to implement Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. Unless expressly provided in this policy, the terms in this policy shall have the same definitions provided in Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and Chapter 16 of Division 3 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations.

Criteria for Low-Threat Case Closure
In the absence of unique attributes of a case or site-specific conditions that demonstrably increase the risk associated with residual petroleum constituents, cases that meet the general and media-specific criteria described in this policy pose a low threat to human health, safety or the environment and are appropriate for closure pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. Cases that meet the criteria in this policy do not require further corrective action and shall be issued a uniform closure letter consistent with Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. Annually, or at the request of the responsible party or party conducting the corrective action, the regulatory agency shall conduct a review to determine whether the site meets the criteria contained in this policy.

It is important to emphasize that the criteria described in this policy do not attempt to describe the conditions at all low-threat petroleum UST sites in the State. The regulatory agency shall issue a closure letter for a case that does not meet these criteria if the regulatory agency determines the site to be low-threat based upon a site specific analysis.

This policy recognizes that some petroleum-release sites may possess unique attributes and that some site specific conditions may make case closure under this policy inappropriate, despite the satisfaction of the stated criteria in this policy. It is impossible to completely capture those sets of attributes that may render a site ineligible for closure based on this low-threat policy. This policy relies on the regulatory agency’s use of the conceptual site model to identify the special attributes that would require specific attention prior to the application of low-threat criteria. In these cases, it is the regulatory agency’s responsibility to identify the conditions that make closure under the policy inappropriate.
General Criteria
General criteria that must be satisfied by all candidate sites are listed as follows:

a. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system;
b. The unauthorized release consists only of petroleum;
c. The unauthorized ("primary") release from the UST system has been stopped;
d. Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable;
e. A conceptual site model that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release has been developed;
f. Secondary source has been removed to the extent practicable;
g. Soil or groundwater has been tested for methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) and results reported in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 25296.15; and
h. Nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050 does not exist at the site.

a. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system
This policy is protective of existing water supply wells. New water supply wells are unlikely to be installed in the shallow groundwater near former UST release sites. However, it is difficult to predict, on a statewide basis, where new wells will be installed, particularly in rural areas that are undergoing new development. This policy is limited to areas with available public water systems to reduce the likelihood that new wells in developing areas will be inadvertently impacted by residual petroleum in groundwater. Case closure outside of areas with a public water system should be evaluated based upon the fundamental principles in this policy and a site specific evaluation of developing water supplies in the area. For purposes of this policy, a public water system is a system for the provision of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances that has 15 or more service connections or regularly serves at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days out of the year.

b. The unauthorized release consists only of petroleum
For the purposes of this policy, petroleum is defined as crude oil, or any fraction thereof, which is liquid at standard conditions of temperature and pressure, which means 60 degrees Fahrenheit and 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute, including the following substances: motor fuels, jet fuels, distillate fuel oils, residual fuel oils, lubricants, petroleum solvents and used oils, including any additives and blending agents such as oxygenates contained in the formulation of the substances.

c. The unauthorized release has been stopped
The tank, pipe, or other appurtenant structure that released petroleum into the environment (i.e. the primary source) has been removed, repaired or replaced. It is not the intent of this policy to allow sites with ongoing leaks from the UST system to qualify for low-threat closure.

d. Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable
At petroleum unauthorized release sites where investigations indicate the presence of free product, free product shall be removed to the maximum extent practicable. In meeting the requirements of this section:

a. Free product shall be removed in a manner that minimizes the spread of the unauthorized release into previously uncontaminated zones by using recovery and disposal techniques appropriate to the hydrogeologic conditions at the site, and that properly treats, discharges or disposes of recovery byproducts in compliance with applicable laws;
b. Abatement of free product migration shall be used as a minimum objective for the
design of any free product removal system; and
c. Flammable products shall be stored for disposal in a safe and competent manner
to prevent fires or explosions.

e. **A conceptual site model that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release has been developed**
The Conceptual Site Model (CSM) is a fundamental element of a comprehensive site
investigation. The CSM establishes the source and attributes of the unauthorized release,
describes all affected media (including soil, groundwater, and soil vapor as appropriate),
describes local geology, hydrogeology and other physical site characteristics that affect
contaminant environmental transport and fate, and identifies all confirmed and potential
contaminant receptors (including water supply wells, surface water bodies, structures and their
inhabitants). The CSM is relied upon by practitioners as a guide for investigative design and
data collection. Petroleum release sites in California occur in a wide variety of hydrogeologic
settings. As a result, contaminant fate and transport and mechanisms by which receptors may
be impacted by contaminants vary greatly from location to location. Therefore, the CSM is
unique to each individual release site. All relevant site characteristics identified by the CSM
shall be assessed and supported by data so that the nature, extent and mobility of the release
have been established to determine conformance with applicable criteria in this policy. The
supporting data and analysis used to develop the CSM are not required to be contained in a
single report and may be contained in multiple reports submitted to the regulatory agency over
a period of time.

f. **Secondary source has been removed to the extent practicable**
"Secondary source" is defined as petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or
immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Unless site attributes
prevent secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist whose
removal or relocation would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release sites
are required to undergo secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described
herein. "To the extent practicable" means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which
removes or destroys-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. It is
expected that most secondary mass removal efforts will be completed in one year or less.
Following removal or destruction of the secondary source, additional removal or active remedial
actions shall not be required by regulatory agencies unless (1) necessary to abate a
demonstrated threat to human health or (2) the groundwater plume does not meet the definition
of low threat as described in this policy.

g. **Soil and groundwater have been tested for MTBE and results reported in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 25296.15**
Health and Safety Code section 25296.15 prohibits closing a UST case unless the soil,
groundwater, or both, as applicable have been tested for MTBE and the results of that testing
are known to the Regional Water Board. The exception to this requirement is where a
regulatory agency determines that the UST that leaked has only contained diesel or jet fuel.
Before closing a UST case pursuant to this policy, the requirements of section 25296.15, if
applicable, shall be satisfied.
h. Nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050 does not exist at the site

Water Code section 13050 defines "nuisance" as anything which meets all of the following requirements:

1) Is injurious to health, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property.

2) Affects at the same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons, although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal.

3) Occurs during, or as a result of, the treatment or disposal of wastes.

For the purpose of this policy, waste means a petroleum release.

Media-Specific Criteria

Releases from USTs can impact human health and the environment through contact with any or all of the following contaminated media: groundwater, surface water, soil, and soil vapor. Although this contact can occur through ingestion, dermal contact, or inhalation of the various media, the most common drivers of health risk are ingestion of groundwater from drinking water wells, inhalation of vapors accumulated in buildings, contact with near surface contaminated soil, and inhalation of vapors in the outdoor environment. To simplify implementation, these media and pathways have been evaluated and the most common exposure scenarios have been combined into three media-specific criteria:

1. Groundwater
2. Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air
3. Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure

Candidate sites must satisfy all three of these media-specific criteria as described below.

1. Groundwater

This policy describes criteria on which to base a determination that threats to existing and anticipated beneficial uses of groundwater have been mitigated or are de minimis, including cases that have not affected groundwater.

State Water Board Resolution 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304 is a state policy for water quality control and applies to petroleum UST cases. Resolution 92-49 directs that water affected by an unauthorized release attain either background water quality or the best water quality that is reasonable if background water quality cannot be restored. Any alternative level of water quality less stringent than background must be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, not unreasonably affect current and anticipated beneficial use of affected water, and not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the water quality control plan for the basin within which the site is located. Resolution No. 92-49 does not require that the requisite level of water quality be met at the time of case closure; it specifies compliance with cleanup goals and objectives within a reasonable time frame.

Water quality control plans (Basin Plans) generally establish "background" water quality as a restorative endpoint. This policy recognizes the regulatory authority of the Basin Plans but underscores the flexibility contained in Resolution 92-49.
It is a fundamental tenet of this low-threat closure policy that if the closure criteria described in this policy are satisfied at a petroleum unauthorized release site, attaining background water quality is not feasible, establishing an alternate level of water quality not to exceed that prescribed in the applicable Basin Plan is appropriate, and that water quality objectives will be attained through natural attenuation within a reasonable time, prior to the expected need for use of any affected groundwater.

If groundwater with a designated beneficial use is affected by an unauthorized release, to satisfy the media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites listed below. A plume that is "stable or decreasing" is a contaminant mass that has expanded to its maximum extent: the distance from the release where attenuation exceeds migration.

**Groundwater-Specific Criteria**

1. a. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 100 feet in length.
   b. There is no free product.
   c. The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is greater than 250 feet from the defined plume boundary.

2. a. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 250 feet in length.
   b. There is no free product.
   c. The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary.
   d. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 3,000 micrograms per liter (µg/l), and the dissolved concentration of MTBE is less than 1,000 µg/l.

3. a. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 250 feet in length.
   b. Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable, may still be present below the site where the release originated, but does not extend off-site.
   c. The plume has been stable or decreasing for a minimum of five years.
   d. The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary.
   e. The property owner is willing to accept a land use restriction if the regulatory agency requires a land use restriction as a condition of closure.

4. a. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 1,000 feet in length.
   b. There is no free product.
   c. The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary.
   d. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 1,000 µg/l, and the dissolved concentration of MTBE is less than 1,000 µg/l.

5. a. The regulatory agency determines, based on an analysis of site specific conditions that under current and reasonably anticipated near-term future scenarios, the contaminant plume poses a low threat to human health and safety and to the environment and water quality objectives will be achieved within a reasonable time frame.
Sites with Releases That Have Not Affected Groundwater
Sites with soil that does not contain sufficient mobile constituents [leachate, vapors, or light non-aqueous-phase liquids (LNAPL)] to cause groundwater to exceed the groundwater criteria in this policy shall be considered low-threat sites for the groundwater medium. Provided the general criteria and criteria for other media are also met, those sites are eligible for case closure.

For older releases, the absence of current groundwater impact is often a good indication that residual concentrations present in the soil are not a source for groundwater pollution.

2. Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air
Exposure to petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater to indoor air may pose unacceptable human health risks. This policy describes conditions, including bioattenuation zones, which if met will assure that exposure to petroleum vapors in indoor air will not pose unacceptable health risks. In many petroleum release cases, potential human exposures to vapors are mitigated by bioattenuation processes as vapors migrate toward the ground surface. For the purposes of this section, the term “bioattenuation zone” means an area of soil with conditions that support biodegradation of petroleum hydrocarbon vapors.

The low-threat vapor-intrusion criteria described below apply to sites where the release originated and impacted or potentially impacted adjacent parcels when: (1) existing buildings are occupied or may be reasonably expected to be occupied in the future, or (2) buildings for human occupancy are reasonably expected to be constructed in the future. Appendices 1 through 4 (attached) illustrate four potential exposure scenarios and describe characteristics and criteria associated with each scenario. Petroleum release sites shall satisfy the media-specific criteria for petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air and be considered low-threat for the vapor-intrusion-to-indoor-air pathway if:

a. Site-specific conditions at the release site satisfy all of the characteristics and criteria of scenarios 1 through 3 as applicable, or all of the characteristics and criteria of scenario 4 as applicable; or

b. A site-specific risk assessment for the vapor intrusion pathway is conducted and demonstrates that human health is protected to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency; or

c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, the regulatory agency determines that petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health.

Exception: Exposures to petroleum vapors associated with historical fuel system releases are comparatively insignificant relative to exposures from small surface spills and fugitive vapor releases that typically occur at active fueling facilities. Therefore, satisfaction of the media-specific criteria for petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air is not required at active commercial petroleum fueling facilities, except in cases where release characteristics can be reasonably believed to pose an unacceptable health risk.
3. Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure
This policy describes conditions where direct contact with contaminated soil or inhalation of contaminants volatized to outdoor air poses a low threat to human health. Release sites where human exposure may occur satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure and shall be considered low-threat if they meet any of the following:

a. Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the specified depth below ground surface (bgs). The concentration limits for 0 to 5 feet bgs protect from ingestion of soil, dermal contact with soil, and inhalation of volatile soil emissions and inhalation of particulate emissions. The 5 to 10 feet bgs concentration limits protect from inhalation of volatile soil emissions. Both the 0 to 5 feet bgs concentration limits and the 5 to 10 feet bgs concentration limits for the appropriate site classification (Residential or Commercial/Industrial) shall be satisfied. In addition, if exposure to construction workers or utility trench workers are reasonably anticipated, the concentration limits for Utility Worker shall also be satisfied; or

b. Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil are less than levels that a site specific risk assessment demonstrates will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health; or

c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, the regulatory agency determines that the concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health.

Table 1
Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Soil That Will Have No Significant Risk of Adversely Affecting Human Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial/Industrial</th>
<th>Utility Worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5 feet bgs</td>
<td>Volatilization to outdoor air</td>
<td>0 to 5 feet bgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>(5 to 10 feet bgs) mg/kg</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH(^1)</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Based on the seven carcinogenic poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) as benzo(a)pyrene toxicity equivalent [BaPe]. Sampling and analysis for PAH is only necessary where soil as affected by either waste oil or Bunker C fuel.
2. The area of impacted soil where a particular exposure occurs is 25 by 25 meters (approximately 82 by 82 feet) or less.
3. NA = not applicable
4. mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram
Low-Threat Case Closure

Cases that meet the general and media-specific criteria established in this policy pose a low threat to human health, safety and the environment and satisfy the case-closure requirements of Health and Safety Code section 25296.10, and case closure is consistent with State Water Board Resolution 92-49 that requires that cleanup goals and objectives be met within a reasonable time frame. If the case has been determined by the regulatory agency to meet the criteria in this policy, the regulatory agency shall notify responsible parties that they are eligible for case closure and that the following items, if applicable, shall be completed prior to the issuance of a uniform closure letter specified in Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. After completion of these items, and unless the regulatory agency revises its determination based on comments received on the proposed case closure, the regulatory agency shall issue a uniform closure letter within 30 days from the end of the comment period.

a. Notification Requirements – Municipal and county water districts, water replenishment districts, special act districts with groundwater management authority, agencies with authority to issue building permits for land affected by the petroleum release, owners and occupants of the property impacted by the petroleum release, and the owners and occupants of all parcels adjacent to the impacted property shall be notified of the proposed case closure and provided a 60 day period to comment. The regulatory agency shall consider any comments received when determining if the case should be closed or if site specific conditions warrant otherwise.

b. Monitoring Well Destruction – All wells and borings installed for the purpose of investigating, remediating, or monitoring the unauthorized release shall be properly destroyed prior to case closure unless a property owner certifies that they will keep and maintain the wells or borings in accordance with applicable local or state requirements.

c. Waste Removal – All waste piles, drums, debris and other investigation or remediation derived materials shall be removed from the site and properly managed in accordance with regulatory agency requirements.
Appendix 1
Scenario 1: Unweathered* LNAPL in Groundwater

Required Characteristics of the Bioattenuation Zone:

1. The bioattenuation zone shall be a continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 30 feet vertically between the LNAPL in groundwater and the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and
2. Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) are less than 100 mg/kg throughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone.

TPH = total petroleum hydrocarbons
TPH-g = total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline
TPH-d = total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel

*As used in this context, unweathered LNAPL is generally understood to mean petroleum product that has not been subjected to significant volatilization or solubilization, and therefore has not lost a significant portion of its volatile or soluble constituents (e.g., comparable to recently dispensed fuel).
Appendix 2
Scenario 2: Unweathered* LNAPL in Soil

Required Characteristics of the Bioattenuation Zone:

1. The bioattenuation zone shall be a continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 30 feet both laterally and vertically between the LNAPL in soil and the foundation of existing or potential buildings, and
2. Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) are less than 100 mg/kg throughout the entire lateral and vertical extent of the bioattenuation zone.

*As used in this context, unweathered LNAPL is generally understood to mean petroleum product that has not been subjected to significant volatilization or solubilization, and therefore has not lost a significant portion of its volatile or soluble constituents (e.g., comparable to recently dispensed fuel).
### Appendix 3

**Scenario 3 - Dissolved Phase Benzene Concentrations in Groundwater**

(Low concentration groundwater scenarios with or without oxygen data)

(1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining the Bioattenuation Zone Without Oxygen Data or Oxygen &lt; 4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Building or Future Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure A</th>
<th>Benzene &lt; 100 µg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPH &lt; 100 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure B</th>
<th>Benzene ≥ 100 µg/L and &lt; 1000 µg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPH &lt; 100 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Required Characteristics of Bioattenuation Zone for Sites Without Oxygen Data or Where Oxygen is < 4%

**Figure A:** 1) Where benzene concentrations are less than 100 µg/L, the bioattenuation zone:

a) Shall be a continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 5 feet vertically between the dissolved phase Benzene and the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and  

b) Contain Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) less than 100 mg/kg throughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone.

**Figure B:** 1) Where benzene concentrations are equal to or greater than 100 µg/L but less than 1000 µg/L, the bioattenuation zone:

a) Shall be a continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 10 feet vertically between the dissolved phase Benzene and the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and  

b) Contain Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) less than 100 mg/kg throughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone.
Appendix 3
Scenario 3 - Dissolved Phase Benzene Concentrations in Groundwater
(Low concentration groundwater scenarios with or without oxygen data)
(2 of 2)

Defining the Bioattenuation Zone With Oxygen ≥ 4%

Existing Building or Future Construction

Required Characteristics of Bioattenuation Zone for Sites With Oxygen ≥ 4%

Where benzene concentrations are less than 1000 µg/L, the bioattenuation zone:

1. Shall be a continuous zone that provides a separation of least 5 feet vertically between the dissolved phase Benzene and the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and
2. Contain Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) less than 100 mg/kg throughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone.
Appendix 4
Scenario 4 - Direct Measurement of Soil Gas Concentrations
(1 of 2)

Soil Gas Sampling – No Bioattenuation Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Building</th>
<th>Future Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a - sample location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b - sample location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria in the table below apply unless the requirements for a bioattenuation zone, established below, are satisfied.

When applying the criteria below, the soil gas sample must be obtained from the following locations:

a. Beneath or adjacent to an existing building: The soil gas sample shall be collected at least five feet below the bottom of the building foundation.
b. Future construction: The soil gas sample shall be collected from at least five feet below ground surface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Gas Criteria (mg/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Bioattenuation Zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the no bioattenuation zone, the screening criteria are same as the California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) with engineered fill below sub-slab.
The criteria in the table below apply if the following requirements for a bioattenuation zone are satisfied:

1. There is a minimum of five vertical feet of soil between the soil vapor measurement and the foundation of an existing building or ground surface of future construction.
2. TPH (TPHg + TPHd) is less than 100 mg/kg (measured in at least two depths within the five-foot zone.)
3. Oxygen is greater than or equal to four percent measured at the bottom of the five-foot zone.

### Soil Gas Criteria (**μg/m³**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Residential Soil Gas Concentration (<strong>μg/m³</strong>)</th>
<th>Commercial Soil Gas Concentration (<strong>μg/m³</strong>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>&lt; 85,000</td>
<td>&lt; 280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>&lt; 1,100,000</td>
<td>&lt; 3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>&lt; 93,000</td>
<td>&lt; 310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A 1000-fold bioattenuation of petroleum vapors is assumed for the bioattenuation zone.**