

From: [LRSussmanlaw](#)
To: [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Teague, Corey \(CPC\)](#); [May, Christopher \(CPC\)](#); bgladstone@g3mh.com
Subject: Planning Department Case No. 2017-013272DRP
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:57:23 AM
Attachments: [Letter to SF Planning Commission re Support of Continuance - 3074 Pacific Ave - 04.30.2020.pdf](#)

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

Dear Mr. Koppel and Commissioners:

Please see the attached letter in support of the proposed continuance of the hearing on the Discretionary Review Request in the above referenced matter on calendar for a hearing today.

Larry

Lawrence R. Sussman
Law Office of Lawrence R. Sussman
423 Washington St., Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415-788-7000
Fax: 415-296-0999
lrsussmanlaw@gmail.com
ls@sheppardlaw.com

Confidential Communication:

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended solely for ADDRESSEE(S) named, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, private and precluded from discovery and/or disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee, agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, please note and understand that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this electronic mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply to this message and entirely delete this e-mail and all attachments. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [Varat, Adam \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Flores, Claudia \(CPC\)](#); [Chion, Miriam \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Yen, Aaron \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Commission Packet item for May 7: COVID-19/Physical Distance Public Participation Memo
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:10:30 AM
Attachments: [CPC Memo Public Participation .docx](#)

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Varat, Adam (CPC) has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

 [CPC Memo Public Participation .docx](#)

<!--[endif]-->

Dear Planning Commissioners -

Please see attached memo and document regarding COVID-19/Physical Distance Public Participation Guidance. This memo is informational describing how we are considering public participation as part of our comprehensive planning work at this time. It is not tied to a specific agenda item on next week's agenda.

Please feel free to reach out to me with any thoughts or questions.

Sincerely,
Adam

Adam Varat
Deputy Director, Citywide Planning Division

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6405 **Fax:** 415-558-6409
Email: adam.varat@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: [aj](#)
To: [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [James Hsue](#)
Cc: [Cat Carter](#); [tselby](#); [Robert Feinbaum](#); [Jean Barish](#); [SNA BRC](#); [Supawanich, Paul \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reservoir EIR Transit Delay Re: RTC
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:03:42 AM

Thanks, Jeanie.

QUESTION: Before basically dismissing my transit delay comments, weren't your analysts interested in understanding transit delay from a MUNI Operations standpoint (vs. a Planners standpoint)?!

Did they even bother to talk to any of the Operators taking their layovers at City College Terminal? How about the Inspectors who deal with line management?

It's obvious to me that the Planners' operational knowledge is limited when they conflate "stops" with "timepoints."

Also, Planning Dept understanding of "substantial evidence" is faulty:

- I had presented an analysis of 43 delay from timepoint to timepoint based on Kittelson data. My analysis apparently was dismissed as lacking "substantial evidence." Yet because my analysis (based on your own Kittelson data and official SFMTA schedules) was unfavorable to your less-than-significant determination, the SEIR has been revised to conveniently eliminate the City College Terminal to BP Station segment from EIR analysis of the 43's 7-minute running time timepoint-to-timepoint (Monterey /Gennessee to Balboa tPark Station) segment.
- I had challenged the SEIR's misuse of the City Charter's 4-minute late standard for scheduled timepoints as your Significance Criterion for Transit Delay. The RTC refers to the Planning Dept's Transit Impact Assessment Guidelines as "substantial evidence" to justify using 4-minute delay as the threshold of significance. In a careful reading of the TIA Guidelines, the 4-minute transit delay standard is simply an assertion, containing not even a shred of evidence that would support the assertion. Using common sense, how could a 4 minute delay within a 7-minute running time route segment be objectively considered "less-than-significant"?!

An EIR is supposed to be an objective analysis. However, actually it's similar to the run-up to the Iraq War: The facts were being fixed around the policy.

Sincerely,
Alvin Ja

On Thursday, April 30, 2020, 8:25:52 AM PDT, Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Alvin,

You'll receive a copy by Fedex tomorrow. It was s

Thanks,

Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9072 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information](#).

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 4:23 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Subject: RTC

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

Hi Jeanie,

Please send me a hard copy of RTC.

Thanks,

Alvin Ja

546 Flood Ave

SF, CA 94112

From: [Joseph Smooke](#)
To: [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [RivamonteMesa, Abigail \(BOS\)](#); [Angelica Cabande](#)
Subject: 701 Harrison St :: Project No. 2018-008661
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 9:54:02 AM
Attachments: [SOMCAN Letter 701 Harrison 30 April 2020.pdf](#)

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

Dear Director Hillis, President Koppel and Planning Commissioners

Please see SOMCAN's letter for today's hearing regarding 701 Harrison Street (attached)

Due to the fact that we are dealing with immediate community needs at this time, we might not be able to provide verbal testimony during today's hearing.

We hope you take into account our concerns with this project during the hearing today.

Thanks so much.

--joseph
SOMCAN Board Chair

--

co-founder [People Power Media](#)
josephsmooke.photoshelter.com/archive

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 150 Waverly Case 2019-020999CUA
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 8:06:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Dennis Hong <dennisj.gov88@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 8:04 PM
To: Lindsay, Ashley (CPC) <ashley.lindsay@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>; yanhuali1981@gmail.com
Subject: 150 Waverly Case 2019-020999CUA

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

Good evening Miss Ashley Lindsay, Honorable Planning Commissioners and everyone, I trust you are all doing well. Considering the ongoing current events and the SIP I hope my comments are timely and get to you in time. Unfortunately I will be unable to chime in with this Remote Hearing - CU Project at 150 Waverly Place item number B.15. on the 4/30/2020 agenda. I have been following this project when possible including some resent on site visits and keeping my Social Distance at the same time. **I fully support this project.** We need to continual fill these vacancies not another blight. With the current vacant retail space/s, this mom and pop retail fits the bill for the success of Chinatown - as it continues to survive.

My name is Dennis H. I'm a native and a current resident of San Francisco for seventy plus years. I grew up and worked in Chinatown, North Beach (district 3) for 60 plus years. Currently living in District 7 and retired.

I have reviewed this well prepared Conditional Use Document. One thing that stands out is the

proposed layout for this too tinny space. Its classic, even the furniture. I believe that's what Chinatown needs. In looking at the past few years we lost several wonderful opportunities for reviving Chinatown. I hope we do not loose this opportunity. Coming from the Old school in Chinatown I really like what The Spicy Shrimp is proposing to do here. Even the drawings take from the old school. And yes; I too lived in two alleys growing up; Ross Alley and Bannan Place.

Finally, in closing I too hope you and the Planning Commission will approve this new addition. Honestly, we can't afford to continue to loose these unique opportunities. Its small business that continue to keep the city up beat.

Should anyone have any questions to my rambling email, please feel free to reach out to me because I would like to hear your concern/s good or bad.

Sincerely, Dennis Hong

From: [Raquel Redondiez](#)
To: [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [David Woo](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [RivamonteMesa, Abigail \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item: 2018-00866 -- 701 Harrison Street
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 6:15:38 PM

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

Dear Commission President Koppel and Planning Commissioners and Director Hillis:

We're writing to request that you continue the proposed project at 701 Harrison Street which undermines existing policy regarding the 50,000 square foot office limit by trying to push forward a 58,000+ square foot project under this small office cap and which only furthers a type of development - office - which is not a community serving use in the South of Market.

As far as we know, the developer has not done any outreach to community based organizations or SOMA Pilipinas regarding this proposed office development. The project is located within the SOMA Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District (something that is not even mentioned in the planning documents).

As you know, SOMA Pilipinas was created to help stabilize, strengthen, and celebrate the Filipino community in the South of Market. This includes protecting renters, supporting needed affordable housing developments, supporting the creation of low-barrier living wage jobs for residents, and promoting land use that benefits the working-class in SOMA. This project speaks to none of those goals.

We do not need more luxury office development in the South of Market. Especially during this time of crisis with COVID-19 when small businesses, non-profits, and residents are struggling to stay afloat and alive, we ask that the Planning Department move forward with projects that do not support existing community needs.

The proposed project is also located right next to the Youth and Family Special Use District, which was created to strengthen and preserve youth and families in the South of Market and ensure that proposed development support those needs. This type of development goes against the goals of the Youth and Family SUD. The Youth and Family SUD, and the general geographical context of where this development is proposed, must be recognized and identified by the Planning Department and the developer and the project must reflect these realities and goals in any proposed development.

As you may know, community stakeholders have long been advocating for the strengthening and expansion of the Youth and Family Special Use District boundaries which we hope will be put forward through as part of our CHHESS- Cultural Heritage, Housing, and Economic Sustainability Strategy process.

Lastly, we reiterate our request that the Planning Commission suspend hearing items that are not essential to move forward at this time when community input is severely limited.

Sincerely,

Raquel Redondiez
Director SOMA Pilipinas

--

Raquel R. Redondiez
SOMA Pilipinas Director
Filipino Cultural Heritage District
Filipino-American Development Foundation

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1331-1335 Grant Avenue; 4/30 hearing; 2019-004021CUA
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 12:48:00 PM
Attachments: [Email to CPC 04.29.2020.pdf](#)

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 11:51 AM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; Asbagh, Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1331-1335 Grant Avenue; 4/30 hearing; 2019-004021CUA

Hello Jonas,

Could you please forward this to the full Commission? Commissioner Diamond requested that we provide some clarification regarding this item prior to tomorrow's hearing. Staff is not requesting that the item be pulled from the consent calendar.

Thank you,

Michael Christensen
Senior Planner | Cannabis Permitting Coordinator
Michael.Christensen@sfgov.org

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Balboa Reservoir Project - responses to comments on the draft subsequent EIR
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 12:48:00 PM

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 12:16 PM

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

Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project - responses to comments on the draft subsequent EIR

Hello Commissioners,

The responses to comments document has been published and is available for review at [this link](#).

The responses to comments document, along with the draft subsequent EIR, will be before you for final EIR certification on May 28, 2020.

Please let me know if you have any questions on the environmental review for this project.

Thank you.

Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9072 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: REQUEST TO REMOVE FROM CONSENT CALENDAR - Item No. 17, Grant Ave Cannabis Dispensary
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 12:44:03 PM
Attachments: [THD Ltr_Dispensary_FINAL 4-29-20.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: Stan Hayes <stanhayes1967@gmail.com>
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 at 12:07 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: REQUEST TO REMOVE FROM CONSENT CALENDAR - Item No. 17, Grant Ave Cannabis Dispensary

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

Mr. Ionin -

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, we request that the Planning Commission remove from the Consent Calendar the above-referenced Item No. 17 (2019-004021CUA) to discuss the addition of several important approval conditions.

In our attached letter to the Planning Commission, we offer two conditions of our support for the establishment of a cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue:

1. That the cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue shall not be expanded into the adjacent (adjoining) space at 1331 Grant Avenue, which shall be, and remain, an independent, non-cannabis related retail use.
2. That a Traffic Control Plan for the cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue shall be developed and implemented.

We urge inclusion of the the above conditions of approval in the Conditional Use Authorization

(CUA).

Regards,

Stan Hayes

President
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

From: [Stan Hayes](#)
To: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: brendan@hallinan-law.com; [Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Danny Macchiarini](#); [kathleendooley58](#)
Subject: REQUEST TO REMOVE FROM CONSENT CALENDAR - Item No. 17, Grant Ave Cannabis Dispensary
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 12:17:01 PM
Attachments: [THD Ltr Dispensary FINAL 4-29-20.pdf](#)

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

President Koppel, Vice-President Moore, and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, we request that the Planning Commission remove from the Consent Calendar the above-referenced Item No. 17 (2019-004021CUA) to discuss the addition of several important approval conditions.

Please see our attached letter for additional details.

In our letter, we offer two conditions of our support for the establishment of a cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue:

1. That the cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue shall not be expanded into the adjacent (adjoining) space at 1331 Grant Avenue, which shall be, and remain, an independent, non-cannabis related retail use.
2. That a Traffic Control Plan for the cannabis retail use at 1335 Grant Avenue shall be developed and implemented.

We urge that you include the above conditions of approval in the Conditional Use Authorization (CUA).

Regards,

Stan Hayes

President
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** SAN FRANCISCO AND BAY AREA EXTEND STAY HOME ORDER THROUGH END OF MAY
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 11:30:30 AM
Attachments: [04.29.20 May Stay Home Order.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

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

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

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 at 11:13 AM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** SAN FRANCISCO AND BAY AREA EXTEND STAY HOME ORDER THROUGH END OF MAY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Wednesday, April 29, 2020

Contact: San Francisco Joint Information Center, 415-558-2712, dempres@sfgov.org

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

SAN FRANCISCO AND BAY AREA EXTEND STAY HOME ORDER THROUGH END OF MAY

Extension of the Health Order is designed to maintain progress on slowing the spread of the coronavirus. The modified Order will loosen restrictions on some lower-risk activities.

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and Director of Health Dr. Grant Colfax today announced that San Francisco and six other Bay Area jurisdictions will extend the Stay Home Orders through the end of May in order to maintain progress on slowing the spread of the coronavirus. The new Stay Home Order will go into effect at 11:59 pm on May 3, 2020.

In recognition of the gains made to date, the new orders will include minor modifications, while keeping social distancing, face covering, and other safety measures in place. While mass gatherings and crowded occasions are still months away from being permitted, the new regional Stay Home orders will allow some lower-risk outdoor activities and jobs to resume once the new Order goes into effect.

“The sacrifices of San Franciscans are making it possible to flatten the curve of coronavirus cases in our community. The extended health order recognizes our progress, while also keeping us on course,” said Mayor Breed. “The small changes to loosen restrictions on some

lower-risk activities are the result of the outstanding job by our residents of abiding by the rules and precautions that have helped keep our community safe. I know this is hard for everyone, but we have to keep our focus on protecting public health every step of the way. Our focus now must be on continuing to strengthen our system and track progress as we plan for the future steps can take if we continue to see improvements.”

Under the extended Stay Home Order, all construction will be allowed to resume as long as specific safety measures are in place. Certain businesses that operate primarily outdoors, such as plant nurseries, car washes, and flea markets, may reopen under San Francisco’s Order. Any employee of a business allowed to operate under the order can also access childcare programs that are allowed to operate. Some outdoor recreational facilities, like skate parks and golf courses, may reopen. The full text of the new order and answers to frequently asked questions will be posted at [SF.gov](https://www.sfgov.gov).

Consistent with the plan to reintroduce lower-risk outdoor activity, Mayor Breed on Monday announced the closure of JFK Drive through Golden Gate Park and John Shelley Drive in McLaren Park. These closures will last for the duration of the Stay Home Order, to allow San Franciscans who choose to leave their homes more room to exercise while staying 6 feet from others and following other precautions.

“For this next phase to be successful, it is essential that all San Franciscans and Bay Area residents continue to stay home as much as possible, practice social distancing, wear face coverings when around other people, wash hands frequently, and stay vigilant in fighting the spread of the coronavirus,” said Dr. Colfax. “We will be watching the data very carefully, and do not want to see an erosion of our progress that could reverse everyone’s hard work and sacrifice.”

The Bay Area regional approach aligns with Governor Newsom’s ongoing statewide Stay Home Order, and the framework he has laid out for the state’s recovery. As the Health Officers evaluate when and how to loosen restrictions in the coming weeks and months, the key indicators that San Francisco and its regional partners will be watching include:

- Whether the number of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 is flat or decreasing;
- Whether we have sufficient hospital capacity to meet the needs of our residents;
- Whether there is an adequate supply of personal protective equipment for all health care workers;
- Whether we are meeting the need for testing, especially for persons in vulnerable populations or those in high-risk settings or occupations; and
- Whether we have the capacity to investigate all COVID-19 cases and trace all of their contacts, isolating those who test positive and quarantining the people who may have been exposed.

“The new order allows us to carefully monitor our progress while building the essential public health infrastructure that will support our gradual reopening and make recovery possible,” said Dr. Tomás Aragón, Health Officer for the City and County of San Francisco.

During the month of May, the Health Department and partner agencies will continue to build up the infrastructure required for further reopening. That will include testing, contact tracing, outbreak response, and support services, including multi-lingual outreach and information. Importantly, the consistent practice of social distancing and face covering by members of the

public will be essential to the success of the next phase.

As San Francisco embarks on this next phase, the coronavirus is still circulating in the community, and there is still no vaccine to protect against it. Therefore, everyone must continue to practice precautions, and the City will continue to prioritize vulnerable populations in its response. People who are over 60, or have underlying health conditions, and those who live in congregate settings will remain at high risk for the coronavirus even as the city and region start to reopen.

###

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Prop K Balboa Area TDM: Special Use District
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:59:07 AM

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: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Reply-To: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 9:59 AM

To: "BRCAC (ECN)" <brcac@sfgov.org>, Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>, "sunnyside.balboa.reservoir" <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>, rmuehlbauer <rmuehlbauer@live.com>, cgodinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>, Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>, "marktang.cac@gmail.com" <marktang.cac@gmail.com>, mikeahrens5 <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>, Brigitte Davila <bdavila@ccsf.edu>, jumpstreet1983 <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>

Subject: Prop K Balboa Area TDM: Special Use District

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

Planning Commission, BRCAC:

Several years ago, SFCTA had authorized Prop K monies for a Balboa Area TDM Study.

Out of that authorization, Nelson /Nygaard produced a Balboa Area TDM Framework.

Essentially, the TDM Framework is being promoted as providing measures that would

effectively mitigate harms to the existing setting of City College and neighborhoods that will be generated by the Reservoir Project

However, the TDM measures are fundamentally aspirational without any enforceable means to prevent new Reservoir residents - - especially the well-heeled occupants of the 550 market-rate units-- from using, or owning cars.

Ultimately, despite the TDM measures, car use by the new residents will cause delays to MUNI service. The limited roadway network that surrounds the Reservoir parcel makes any effective practical improvements by SFMTA of Existing MUNI service in the Reservoir Project area is far from achieving the 85% reliability as required by City Charter.

The Reservoir Project will inevitably make MUNI service worse.

Later today (4/28/2020), legislation will be introduced to create a Special Use District that will replace the current P-Public zoning.

Despite the deceptive marketing of the Reservoir Project as 50% affordable, Reservoir Community Partners' breakdown will actually be 550 market-rate units, and only 363 affordable.

RCP cannot legitimately claim credit for the 187 "additional affordable" units that will come from public monies.

Don't facilitate stealth privatization of public lands with SUD.

Instead of the SUD, keep the Reservoir parcel #3180's zoning as P..... .P zoning which allows for 100% affordable.

Alvin Ja

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 333 Valencia - amended condition
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:56:32 AM
Attachments: [Redline Draft Motion - 333 Valencia St.pdf](#)
[Clean Draft Motion - 333 Valencia St.pdf](#)

Amended Motion for tomorrow's Consent Calendar item.

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: "Samonsky, Ella (CPC)" <ella.samonsky@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 11:35 AM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, Richard Sucre <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>
Subject: 333 Valencia - amended condition

Hi Jonas,

We need to strike condition #9 from the draft motion of 333 Valencia Street. The project falls just under the threshold for triggering TDM. Also there is a typo on 10.(B) of the motion findings; it should read that "The project site does **not** possess any existing housing."

I prepared a redline and clean version of the draft motion with these two edits.

Thanks,

Ella Samonsky, Senior Planner
Southeast Team, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9112 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Work During Shelter in Place Order: The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED AND PRESIDENT NORMAN YEE MOVE BALBOA RESERVOIR HOUSING PROJECT FORWARD
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:51:14 AM
Attachments: [04.28.20 Balboa Reservoir Housing.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

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

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

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 2:28 PM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED AND PRESIDENT NORMAN YEE MOVE BALBOA RESERVOIR HOUSING PROJECT FORWARD

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, April 28, 2020

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

**MAYOR LONDON BREED AND PRESIDENT NORMAN YEE
MOVE BALBOA RESERVOIR HOUSING PROJECT
FORWARD**

1,100 new homes—50% affordable—built next to City College will prioritize family-friendly housing and affordable housing for educators.

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee today announced the introduction of legislation to initiate the first steps of the City review process for a housing project on the Balboa Reservoir site. The current project proposal includes building 1,100 new homes with 50% dedicated for affordable homes for families and essential workers, four acres of public open space, a childcare center, and community space. Situated next to City College, it allows for up to 150 of the affordable units to be prioritized for City College faculty and staff housing.

The Balboa Reservoir property is an approximately 17-acre parcel that the City and County of San Francisco owns under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. It is located in the West of Twin Peaks area of south-central San Francisco, north of the Ocean Avenue commercial district, and directly west of the City College of San Francisco Ocean

Campus.

“Our housing shortage did not go away during this pandemic, and now more than ever we need to continue to do the work to build more homes throughout our entire City,” said Mayor Breed. “These new homes at Balboa Reservoir for families, for workers, and for teachers, will help more people be able to live in San Francisco. This is an incredible project on the west side of town, and we need more like it if we are going to make San Francisco affordable for everyone.”

Supervisor Norman Yee established the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee in 2015, which included representatives for neighborhood associations, including Westwood Park, Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, and the Ocean Avenue Association. The Committee provided a public forum to establish principles and parameters for the potential project.

“The Balboa Reservoir project would not be where it is today without the guidance and input of the Community Advisory Committee over the course of five years,” said President Yee. “I hope it will serve as a model for what community-led planning can look like. We need a comprehensive approach to housing and I believe this proposal captures those principles especially incorporating child-friendly design elements, which I have been advocating for citywide. I want to emphasize to the public that this is an iterative process and I look forward to further engagement with the Advisory Committee, community members, City College, and immediate neighbors to ensure that the project we ultimately approve is one we can all be proud of.”

The Development Agreement and Special Use District being introduced at the Board of Supervisors today by President Yee is the result of five years of collaboration between the community, City officials, and City College. The Developer Team will be a partnership between BRIDGE Housing and Avalon Bay Communities with Mission Housing and Habitat for Humanity participating in the affordable housing component of the project.

“The Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee has been the key forum for the community planning process for this project since 2015,” said Jon Winston, the chair of the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee. “I look forward to continuing working with the CAC, President Yee, and City officials to move this project into the next phase of City review.”

Community Driven Project

The project proposal is a response to more than five years of neighborhood outreach and discussion. From neighborhood meetings and workshops in 2014, the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Community (BR CAC) was formed. Over the following year and a half, the CAC created the parameters and goals for the project, and subsequently helped select the developer team. Since their 2017 selection, the Development Team continued to work with the CAC to refine the master plan and complete the environmental review.

550 Affordable Homes

Half of the 1,100 total homes will be affordable to low- and moderate-income families (30% to 120% of Area Median Income). Over 25% of the affordable units will be dedicated to educator housing, with a first preference for City College faculty and staff.

A New Neighborhood Park and Open Green Spaces

The development will include a new two-acre public park, located at the center of the new neighborhood and easily accessible to all community members. This is part of four acres of total public open space, including recreation areas and pedestrian ways.

Child-Friendly Project: Childcare and Community Spaces

A new childcare center will provide 100 spaces for children from families at a range of income levels, and will serve the surrounding community and families who move into the new homes. The project will include a large indoor community space on the ground floor adjacent to the public park. The project will also include housing design elements that will be targeted for families with children and will be guided by the San Francisco Planning Department’s Family-Friendly Housing General Plan Amendment and Design Review Guidelines that are part of Mayor Breed and President Yee’s San Francisco Child and Youth-Friendly City Initiative.

Transportation Improvements

The project will pay approximately \$10 million in Transportation Sustainability Fees to the City for transit and infrastructure improvements. The new neighborhood is designed around transit-first principles to encourage new residents to walk, bike, and ride transit. As a mitigation measure, the project will improve traffic signaling and rearrange dedicated turn arrows along Ocean Avenue, aiding transit and automobile flow.

Collaboration with City College

City College staff and educators will have first preference on over 25% of the affordable units. Public parking options will be available to the City College community to accommodate the redevelopment of the existing reservoir parking lot. Neighborhood design and community amenities will be arranged to provide easy access to the City College community and to complement planned new College buildings.

###

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: continue the CEQA SER policy votes
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:50:26 AM

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: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>

Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 3:42 PM

To: "Board of Supervisors, (BOS)" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Stefani, Catherine (BOS)" <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, "Preston, Dean (BOS)" <dean.preston@sfgov.org>, "Mar, Gordon (BOS)" <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>, "Haney, Matt (BOS)" <matt.haney@sfgov.org>, "MandelmanStaff, [BOS]" <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>, "Walton, Shamann (BOS)" <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>, "Peskin, Aaron (BOS)" <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>, "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>, "Ronen, Hillary" <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>, "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee@sfgov.org>, "Fewer, Sandra (BOS)" <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>, Aaron Hyland <aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com>, Diane Matsuda <dianematsuda@hotmail.com>, "kate.black@sfgov.org" <kate.black@sfgov.org>, Chris Foley <chris.foley@sfgov.org>, Richard Johns <RSEJohns@yahoo.com>, Jonathan Pearlman <jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com>, "So, Lydia (CPC)" <lydia.so@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>

Subject: continue the CEQA SER policy votes

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

Please continue the CEQA SER policy votes until after the stay-at-home order has been lifted for at least a month.

Avoiding public review required by these policies is just another tactic in the baseless assault on quality of life in various communities and on the beauty of San Francisco.

While much of the city is contoured as an amphitheater looking onto water the planning

department continues to approve the Fontana Building type obstructions while disregarding objections of local community. The effect of this abomination is citywide but a particular target is the Sunset District. This is evidenced by the new buildings at 42nd avenue and Noriega street and the construction on Sloat and 48th avenue. Further objectionable permanent protrusions are in the Outlands Plan for both sides of Judah Street between 45th and 44th avenues. No weight is given to the contrary character of the neighborhood, conformity to the general community outlay, future impact as a precedent, increase in congestion, unplanned burdens on infrastructure including services and the needs and desires of the people in the immediate surrounding area. These problems are multiplied by the pandemic which will dampen the public's willingness to take public transportation and increase the propensity for contagion. The only winners in this are the development interests and the politicians they support. There are areas that can sensibly accommodate new housing without these destructive results. San Francisco is the densest city west of the Hudson River. Build with discretion let the needs and desires of the people who live near where the development will come to rest be among the highest priority.

**Steve Ward
Life-long San Franciscan**

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES RELEASE OF BAY AREA'S FIRST DETAILED COVID-19 ALTERNATIVE HOUSING PROGRAM DATA TRACKER
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:49:44 AM
Attachments: [04.28.20 Alternative Housing Data Tracker.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

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

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

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 3:47 PM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES RELEASE OF BAY AREA'S FIRST DETAILED COVID-19 ALTERNATIVE HOUSING PROGRAM DATA TRACKER

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, April 28, 2020

Contact: San Francisco Joint Information Center, 415-558-2712, dempres@sfgov.org

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

**MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES RELEASE OF
BAY AREA'S FIRST DETAILED COVID-19 ALTERNATIVE
HOUSING PROGRAM DATA TRACKER**

San Francisco's COVID-19 Data Tracker now displays information updated daily about the City's ongoing efforts to provide temporary alternative housing for priority vulnerable populations and frontline workers

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed, the Human Services Agency (HSA) and the Controller's Office today announced the release of new data integrated in the San Francisco COVID-19 Data Tracker (<https://datasf.org/covid19>) regarding the COVID-19 Alternative Housing Program. The detailed data, which will be updated daily, outlines efforts by the City to establish temporary emergency housing and shelter options for vulnerable populations, individuals directly affected by the coronavirus, and critical frontline workers.

“San Francisco is in the middle of an unprecedented effort to house people experiencing homelessness and we are leading the way on this effort. We have nearly 25% of the rooms available for occupancy statewide under Governor Newsom's Project Roomkey, while only

having 5% of the State’s homeless population,” said Mayor Breed. “This tracker brings a new level of transparency to these efforts so the public can see the progress that we are making every day.”

Since Mayor Breed declared a State of Emergency on February 25th, the City has been establishing a number of innovative alternative housing options, including private hotels, congregate sites, trailers and recreational vehicles (RVs). Many sites have on-site medical and behavioral health staff as needed for guests. Public health and human services officials assess and determine the most appropriate housing options and on-site services to meet the needs of the different populations. The City monitors and manages the flow into and out of sites used for individuals isolating with COVID-19 or awaiting test results. Once they no longer require sites with medical care, they can be transferred to other City-operated sites or back to their homes with health instructions on how to ensure their continued health and safety post-virus. This site management process ensures that the most space is available for those who need it.

“As San Francisco continues to strengthen its response to reduce the spread of coronavirus, we are adapting to the needs of our residents and adhering to public health guidance at a pace we have never seen before. I am incredibly proud of the achievements of our City workforce and partner agencies to provide thousands of hotel rooms to some of our most vulnerable neighbors,” said Trent Rhorer, Executive Director of the San Francisco Human Services Agency. “Protecting the health of people experiencing homelessness is essential to the health of us all. The addition of our COVID-19 Alternative Housing Program to the City’s open data tracker allows the public to understand our many accomplishments towards providing temporary housing for those in need at this difficult time.”

For asymptomatic people experiencing homelessness, the City is actively developing new sites to ensure the most vulnerable have safe spaces to shelter in place for the duration of the emergency. Sites for this purpose include hotels and trailer/RV sites. Frontline workers who are directly impacted by or face greater exposure to COVID-19 while performing essential duties may access hotel sites for a two-week respite period to preserve our healthcare system capacity and help prevent community spread of the virus.

“I’m immensely proud of our office’s efforts to adapt and learn quickly to produce meaningful data stories in the midst of this emergency,” said Ben Rosenfield, City Controller. “This latest addition to the series of data trackers will help provide clarity about the Alternative Housing program, and inform decisions to support San Francisco’s vulnerable residents and those working on the front lines. The Controller’s Office will continue to champion data-driven decisions and work closely with DataSF and all branches of the Emergency Operations Center to support the City’s tremendous response to the COVID-19 emergency.”

The COVID-19 Data Tracker (<https://datasf.org/covid19>) is an open data partnership of the Department of Public Health, Controller’s Office Performance Unit and DataSF to aggregate feeds of data and review them for public release. DataSF engages City departments and the public in establishing best practices for data sharing, dashboarding, and data science.

###

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2018-008661ENX_revised, 2018-008661ENX
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 10:44:12 AM
Attachments: [2018-008661ENX.docx](#)
[2018-008661ENX_revised.docx](#)

FYI, revised motions for 701 Harrison.

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: "Jardines, Esmeralda (CPC)" <esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org>
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 at 9:26 AM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Richard Sucre <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2018-008661ENX_revised, 2018-008661ENX

Hi Jonas,

My apologies, I should have just sent you the Microsoft word files. The first word file is the original motion, the second word file is the revised motion. Can we please provide this to the Planning Commission before tomorrow's CPC Hearing?

Thank you,
Es

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public hearing Record# 2019-016388CUS
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 8:57:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Second Tsang <secondt@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 10:52 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public hearing Record# 2019-016388CUS

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

Ref: 2019-016388CUS, Zoning Dist.: Ocean Ave NCT/45-X, Block 3283/195

Dear Commissioner,

I have no objection to establish out-patient dialysis center at the abovementioned address. However, I want the center to make sure to keep the vicinity clean, and avoid causing traffic jam on Ocean and Julie ave.

1. I often see lot of blood stains on the side walk and near the current center front door. The center should have cleaned that up right away
2. Drivers stop the car on Ocean ave in front of the center to drop off and pick up patients especially in rush hours. They blocks one lane of Ocean ave for over 15 to 30 minutes

sometime.

3. Driver also stop the car right at the turn of Julie and cause hazard to pedestrians and drivers as well.

If they can resolve these concerns, I will totally support the change of use.

Second Tsang

219 Dorado Ter., SF, CA 94112

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter of support 333 Valencia
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 9:56:00 AM
Attachments: [333 Valencia Letter of support 4.27.20.pdf](#)

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Samonsky, Ella (CPC) <ella.samonsky@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2020 4:15 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Letter of support 333 Valencia

Hi Jonas,

This is the project sponsor letter for 333 Valencia, which is on the consent calendar for Thursday.
Ella

From: Suess, Jeff (ADM) <jeff.suess@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2020 4:00 PM
To: Samonsky, Ella (CPC) <ella.samonsky@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of support 333 Valencia

Ella,

Please find the Director of properties letter of support for the hearing this Friday.

Please let me know if there is anything I need to prepare for the hearing. I understand it is on the consent calendar, but I also realize it could be pulled off. I will have a member of DPH staff on for the hearing as well. Can you kindly let me know how we access the hearing since it is remote?

Thanks

Jeff

Jeff Sues CCIM LEED AP

415-554-9873



City & County of San Francisco

Senior Real Property Officer

Real Estate Division

25 Van Ness, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA. 94102

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO FREE UP \$138 MILLION TO SUPPORT WORKERS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 8:39:21 AM
Attachments: [04.28.20 Health Care Security Ordinance.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

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

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

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 8:35 AM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO FREE UP \$138 MILLION TO SUPPORT WORKERS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, April 28, 2020

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

**MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO FREE UP
\$138 MILLION TO SUPPORT WORKERS DURING THE
COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

\$138 million from SF City Option Medical Reimbursement Accounts will become available for over 100,000 San Francisco employees to use for food, rent, utilities, and other basic needs

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced a plan to allow employees in San Francisco to use funds their employer has contributed in compliance with the Health Care Security Ordinance (HCSO) for necessary expenses such as food, rent, and utilities during the declared local emergency, in addition to eligible health care expenses.

Mayor Breed's Supplemental Declaration will allow over 100,000 covered employees to access funding that their employer has contributed to Medical Reimbursement Accounts (MRAs). The MRAs, provided under the San Francisco City Option, currently have \$138 million in available funds, which is an average of \$1,300 per covered employee. The MRAs are normally designated for medical expenses and health care needs, however during the COVID-19 pandemic, there is an urgent need to provide people with additional resources so

they can afford necessities and remain healthy.

“Our priority during the COVID-19 pandemic is to protect public health, and an important part of ensuring our residents are healthy is making sure people have enough to eat, have a roof over their head, and have the peace of mind that they’ll be able to pay their bills at the end of the month,” said Mayor Breed. “We know that having access to food and housing is a basic need, and by giving people access to the funding in these accounts, we are helping keep people healthy and safe during this challenging time.”

“Workers fought hard for this program to close the gap in healthcare access,” said Supervisor Gordon Mar. “This pandemic has widened the gap, and we must give employees the flexibility to do what they need to remain healthy and support public health.”

“This is the right thing to do in these unprecedented times,” said Supervisor Hillary Ronen. “However, we mustn’t forget that record numbers of people are losing their employer based health insurance during a pandemic when they need it most. This law was always about getting workers the health insurance they deserve and it will continue to play that role in the future until we have a Medicare For All system and healthcare becomes a human right.”

The Health Care Security Ordinance (HCSO) is a San Francisco law that established several employer health care-related obligations enforced by the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement. HCSO created a Health Access Program, including Healthy San Francisco and MRAs, administered by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

Under HCSO, businesses with 20 or more employees and nonprofits with 50 employees or more in San Francisco make health care expenditures including contributions to MRAs, which their employees can access for eligible medical expenses. The City Option employer-funded MRAs have a balance of \$138 million for 104,000 employees, or an average of \$1,300 per eligible employee.

Over half of the employees with MRAs are San Francisco residents and 80 percent are from the Bay Area. The SF City Option covers a wide range of San Francisco employees, including employees in the retail, accommodation, and food service sectors.

Mayor Breed’s Supplemental Declaration allows employees to withdraw funding from their MRAs for basic expenses including food, rent and mortgage payments, and utilities during the declared local emergency. The funding will continue to cover eligible medical expenses. Approximately 104,000 covered employees of San Francisco businesses and nonprofits that have MRAs will be able to request a one-time disbursement of their available funds. Employees can find the most updated information on the San Francisco City Option website (www.sfcityoption.org) about the disbursement.

The SF City Option program will contact eligible employees with MRAs about how to withdraw funds. Employees should always be cautious with their personal or financial information. Individuals should also consult a tax professional about the use of funds. **The SF City Option program will never email or call any SF City Option employee to request their Social Security Number or banking information.** Employees who wish to verify if they have an MRA can also call SF City Option Customer Service at (877) 772-0415.

“The decision to open up MRA funds to workers to use for their essential, every day expenses

is absolutely the right move at the right time,” said Rodney Fong, CEO of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. “Families need this money now to cover critical costs like rent and food. In addition, these released HCSO funds will provide an urgently needed local economic stimulus for our San Francisco small businesses, bringing millions of dollars into our economy to during this COVID-19 downturn.”

“San Francisco’s HCSO has delivered health care benefits to hundreds of thousands of workers, particularly in the restaurant industry,” said Anand Singh, President of the hotel and restaurant workers’ union, UNITE HERE Local 2. “Our City had the foresight to pass this ground-breaking law over a decade ago, and the Mayor’s action shows just how relevant it is today. We look forward to working with the Mayor and the Supervisors to strengthen San Francisco’s health care system in the months and years to come.”

“San Francisco restaurants have paid millions and millions of dollars over the years so their employees can access health care when they need it,” said Anna Weinberg, co-owner of Tosca Cafe and the Big Night Restaurant Group in San Francisco. “We are in a public health emergency unlike any we’ve seen in our lifetimes and workers need those funds for their health and basic living expenses now. I applaud the Mayor’s efforts to return this money to restaurant employees to help them cope with this pandemic.”

The HCSO, along with all other San Francisco labor laws, remains in full effect during the local emergency. Mayor Breed issued this order as part of a Supplement to the Local Emergency Declaration she made on February 25th. All Supplemental Declarations are available at <https://sfmayor.org/mayoral-declarations-regarding-covid-19>.

###

From: [Jonin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: SFECI re Standard CEQA conditions.pdf
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 4:48:13 PM
Attachments: [SFECI re Standard CEQA conditions.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: Alex Lantsberg <alex@sfec.org>
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 at 2:20 PM
To: "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Board of Supervisors, (BOS)" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFECI re Standard CEQA conditions.pdf

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

Please see attached.

Alex Lantsberg
Director of Research & Advocacy
San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry
55 Fillmore St.
San Francisco, CA 94117
Mobile 415.794.2539
@ECI415



Alex Lantsberg
Director of Research & Advocacy
[San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry](#)
55 Fillmore St.
San Francisco, CA 94117
Mobile 415.794.2539
[@ECI415](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 4:09:43 PM

Commissioners,

Please be advised that this matter will be continued from this week's hearing 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

From: "Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS)" <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 at 3:04 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, Dan Sider <dan.sider@sfgov.org>, Aaron Starr <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>, Jeremy Schaub <jeremy@slasf.com>
Subject: RE: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting

Hi, Jonas:

Thanks, I've CC'd Jeremy, he will work with you to find a later date. Jeremy, as soon as I hear from DPH I will circle back with you so that we can have a better idea of what that timeline will look like. Thanks, all, for your time and flexibility, much appreciated.

-Suha

From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2020 2:48 PM
To: Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Sider, Dan (CPC) <dan.sider@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting

Suha,

If the Sponsor has agreed, then all we need is a date.

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: "Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS)" <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 at 1:45 PM
To: Dan Sider <dan.sider@sfgov.org>, Aaron Starr <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting

Thanks, Dan. Jonas, please let me know if you have any questions or need anything from me.

-Suha

From: Sider, Dan (CPC) <dan.sider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2020 1:26 PM
To: Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting

Thanks, Suha. Looping in [@Jonas Ionin](#), our Commission Secretary, so that he is aware and can take it from here.

Daniel A. Sider, AICP
Director of Executive Programs
San Francisco Planning Department
dan.sider@sfgov.org | www.sfplanning.org

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: "Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS)" <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 at 1:04 PM
To: Dan Sider <dan.sider@sfgov.org>, Aaron Starr <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: Item 16a At This Week's Planning Commission Meeting

Hi, Dan and Aaron:

The Supervisor and I have spoken with the architect for item 16a on this week's agenda at the Planning Commission (5500 Mission Street) and he has agreed to have this item continued to a later date. Happy to chat if you would like more details.

Link to Agenda: https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/agendas/2020-04/20200430_cal.pdf

-Suha

Suhagey G. Sandoval
Legislative Aide
Supervisor Ahsha Safaí | District 11
Office | 415.554.7896
Cell | 415.918.9240
Email | Suhagey.Sandoval@sfgov.org
Pronouns: She/her

From: [LRSussmanlaw](#)
To: [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); bgladstone@g3mh.com
Subject: 3074 Pacific Ave. (Case No. 2017-013272DRP) Discretionary Review Request
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 11:52:56 AM
Attachments: [doc08967120200427095216.pdf](#)

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

President Koppel and Members of the Planning Commission:

Attached please find a letter dated April 27, 2020 on behalf of Kelsey and David Lamond, owners of 3070 Pacific Avenue, who oppose the project which is the subject of the above referenced Discretionary Review Request.

Larry

Lawrence R. Sussman
Law Office of Lawrence R. Sussman
423 Washington St., Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415-788-7000
Fax: 415-296-0999
lrsussmanlaw@gmail.com
ls@sheppardlaw.com

Confidential Communication:

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended solely for ADDRESSEE(S) named, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, private and precluded from discovery and/or disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee, agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, please note and understand that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this electronic mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply to this message and entirely delete this e-mail and all attachments. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Signed petition re: 4/23 PC hearing item #15 (rev. 1)
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:43:00 AM
Attachments: [200423_pc petition 1.0.pdf](#)

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Luke Ogrydziak <luke@oparch.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 10:43 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Merlone, Audrey (CPC) <audrey.merlone@sfgov.org>
Subject: Signed petition re: 4/23 PC hearing item #15 (rev. 1)

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

Please find attached a revised version of this petition with several additional signatures.

Best, Luke

--

Luke Ogrydziak | OPA | (415) 474-6724 | oparch.net | [Instagram](#)

The information contained in this electronic mail transmission is intended by OPA solely for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed, and may contain information that is confidential, privileged or otherwise protected by law, including by applicable copyright or other laws protecting intellectual property or trade secrets. If you are not the individual or entity to whom this electronic mail transmission is directed, or otherwise have reason to believe that you received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender by reply email, so that the intended recipient's address can be corrected.

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 4/23 PC Meeting - Petition to the Planning Commission re: grandfathered projects under consideration
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:40:00 AM
Attachments: [2020-04-23 Petition.pdf](#)

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Daniel Robinson <danielr@macarchs.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 12:53 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: David Gast <dgast@gastarchitects.com>
Subject: 4/23 PC Meeting - Petition to the Planning Commission re: grandfathered projects under consideration

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

Hi David - Enclosed is the petition for your comments. It has been CC'd to the Planning Commission as well in this email.

—

Daniel Robinson AIA
MacCracken Architects
479 Ninth Street, Second Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
ph: 415.487.2050 x104
cell: 415-706-3595
web: www.macarchs.com

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: PETITION To add a 'grandfathering' clause to 4/23 PC hearing Item #15:
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:40:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: James Hill <jameshillarchitect@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 1:17 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: PETITION To add a 'grandfathering' clause to 4/23 PC hearing Item #15:

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

Pardon, if I am a little late, but I would also add my support to the petition below.

PETITION

To add a 'grandfathering' clause to 4/23 PC hearing Item #15:
Conditional Use Authorizations for Demonstrably Unaffordable Housing

April 22, 2020

San Francisco Planning Commission
commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: Remote hearing April 23, 2020 Item #15 2020-003035PCA

CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATIONS DEMONSTRABLY UNAFFORDABLE HOUSING
[Board File No. 200142]

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission:

We are writing to request that this ordinance, if approved, include a clause for 'grandfathering' projects already in the Planning process.

Such grandfathering is especially urgent given our unprecedented Covid-19 situation. Both Planning and Building have shut down their physical sites, necessitating novel, digital workflows be developed on the fly. Predictably, this is resulting in both confusion and inefficiency while the kinks are worked out. As such, it is possible that many projects currently in the system will be entirely 'frozen' while the rules change around them. This observation suggests a more general point. The Planning Department, like the Building Department already does, should evaluate projects according to the Code active at the time the project is accepted for review. (Or the current Code, if the project sponsor opts for this.) This approach would create logical consistency and reduce the volatility of what is already a lengthy and unpredictable process. Is there any other situation in business or civic life where one party unilaterally changes the rules AFTER an agreement has been made?

As architects practicing in San Francisco, we often see homeowners purchase (or decline to purchase) properties based largely on Planning Department pre-application feedback. They understand the risks inherent in the process. But it is unreasonable that they should also be asked to absorb the entire playing field arbitrarily changing any time. How can the Commission justify betraying the trust of such individuals, who are trying to understand the rules and play by them in good faith?

We hope that you will consider the inherent flaws in such a disjointed approach to policymaking and use this opportunity to incorporate a 'grandfathering' clause into this and future Planning ordinances. There is one successful precedent for this approach that we are aware of, the recent modification of Section 134.c. – which incorporates the language "based on the applicable law on the date of submission." This ordinance should do the same.

NAME CONTACT FIRM

Julie Jackson AIA

jule@jacksonliles.com

Jackson Liles Architecture

Brian Liles AIA

brian@jacksonliles.com

Jackson Liles Architecture

Daniel Robinson AIA

danielr@macarchs.com

MacCracken Architects

Peter Liang AIA

peter@bluetruckstudio.com

Blue Truck Studio

Jeremy Butler-Pinkham

jeremy@jbparch.com

JBP Architects

Christian Dauer

chr@chrdauer.com

ChrDAUER Architects

Eric Hartz

ehartz@gastarchitects.com

Gast Architects

Lev Weisbach, AIA

lev@weisbachad.com Weisbach Architecture | Design

Tristan Warren

tristan.warren.arch@gmail.com

Tristan Warren Architect

Howard Blecher

howard@bbudesign.com

Blecher Building + Urban Design

Beth Morris

bethm@bmasf.com

BMA

Jim Zack

jim@zackdevito.com

Zack/de Vito Architecture

Benjamin McGriff

benjamin@mcgriffarchitects.com McGriff Architects

Thanks everyone - this has been sent as of 12:52pm 4/23/2020

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Staff reports for The Hub items - request they be posted
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:38:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 10:11 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <Mooreurban@aol.com>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Staff reports for The Hub items - request they be posted

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

Planning Commission Rules on Submittals (D.I.b) allow Commission officers to require that staff packets be provided for an item more than one week in advance of hearing.

The **staff packets** for 4 The Hub items

- FEIR for The Hub Plan + 30 Van Ness + 98 Franklin
- FEIR for 10 South Van Ness
- Market Octavia Plan Amendment CEQA Findings
- Market Octavia Plan Amendment adoption

listed for 4/30 Commission calendar were finalized and approved so they could be posted today with staff reports for other 4/30 items.

The 4 Hub items have been listed for 4/30 hearing for several weeks. Including advance calendar issued this week. At some point in last 2 days The Hub matters were pulled - to be scheduled in a few weeks.

These very lengthy staff reports and documents are for an AREA PLAN and construction of 3 large projects. The public, and supervisor offices, deserve enough time to read and understand these documents. **REPORTS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN WRITTEN AND APPROVED.**

I request that you instruct that the 4 Hub staff reports be posted - WITH A BRIEF STATEMENT THAT HEARING WILL BE AT LATER DATE - with Supporting Documents for 4/30 Commission hearing on Planning website.

As soon as new hearing date is set, these packets can also be added for that date.

Thank you.

Sue Hestor

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Failure to record and respond to DSG comment-- Re: Comment on Implementation Documents: 1. Special Use District (4/6/2020 BRCAC meeting)
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:37:00 AM
Attachments: [5. zoning map 0-0-0-1591.pdf](#)
[6. Open Space Maps-- BPS Area Plan, General Plan, GPA.pdf](#)

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2020 5:16 AM

To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: Public Lands for Public Good <publiclandsforpublicgood@gmail.com>; BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>

Subject: Fw: Failure to record and respond to DSG comment-- Re: Comment on Implementation Documents: 1. Special Use District (4/6/2020 BRCAC meeting)

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

Planning Commission, Supervisors:

The Balboa Reservoir CAC process has been essentially a platform to promote the privatization of public land. Viewpoints and analysis outside the parameters set by Staff and developers are limited to 2-minute snippets.

Without actually allowing for substantive input, the CAC process merely provides a phoney appearance of public engagement which is lacking in substance.

Please see email to Reservoir Staff and CAC, below.

elow.

Alvin Ja, District 7

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

To: BRCAC ECN <brcac@sfgov.org>;

Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2020, 4:49:43 AM PDT

Subject: Failure to record and respond to DSG comment-- Re: Comment on Implementation Documents: 1. Special Use District (4/6/2020 BRCAC meeting)

Leigh, CAC:

I have looked at the CAC website entries for the 4/27/2020 meeting.

Although I had submitted a written comment on your DSG presentation in a timely manner prior to the 4/8 CAC meeting, I see neither a record of, nor a response to, my comment. I commented on the Staff's PowerPoint presentation "DSG presentation with script." The PowerPoint itself had the heading "The Balboa Neighborhood Design Standards and

Guidelines (DSG)." Under "DSG Overview", I commented on "Implementation Documents", below.

Because the CAC format does not allow for substantive discussion outside of what is presented by Staff and developers, I have made the effort to provide you with analysis outside your permitted boundaries of discussion.

Please at the very least put it on the record !

Sincerely,

aj

On Monday, April 6, 2020, 12:10:10 PM PDT, aj <ajahjah@att.net> wrote:

BRCAC members:

You need to be clear on the significance of the Special Use District.

The current zoning for the Reservoir is "P" Public. Public zoning means exactly that-- PUBLIC. The Reservoir parcel is currently zoned for public, not private ownership. The essence of the rezoning from Public to a Special Use District is the PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC PROPERTY.

The current P zoning is intrinsic to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan that came out of the BPS Program-level EIR.

The lower-level Reservoir Project does not comply with the existing higher-level BPS Area Plan.

Because the lower-level Project is non-compliant with the higher-level BPS Area Plan, the project sponsors seek to change the higher-level BPS Area Plan. They seek to rezone the Reservoir parcel from Public to a Special Use District to enable the privatization of public property.

The project sponsors will be presenting a "General Plan Amendment" to the Planning Commission on 4/9/2020. The main feature of the General Plan Amendment will be to rezone the Reservoir from P to Special Use District.

The following, with 2 attachments (Zoning Map and Open Space Maps), has been submitted to the Planning Commission:

- Planning Commission: March 31, 2020

SUBJECT: Balboa Reservoir General Plan Amendment Initiation

You are being asked by Staff to initiate a General Plan Amendment to accommodate Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's development of the Balboa Reservoir.

The proposed General Plan Amendment makes substantial changes in the City & County's General Plan and the associated Balboa Park Station Area Plan.

The proposed change in zoning contained in the GPA is a BIG DEAL.

The biggest deal is the change in zoning from P-Public to a Special Use District. "P" zoning prohibits private ownership. The proposed Special Use District eliminates this public use requirement.

Instead, the rezoning to "Special Use District" will pave the way for the privatization of public land.

This privatization scam has been deceptively marketed as 50% affordable. " 50%

affordable" is a misrepresentation. Here are the facts:

Reservoir Community Partners will develop:

- 550 market-rate units, and
- 363 affordable units

The 550 market-rate/ 363 affordable unit split is the reality of the Reservoir Community Partners development. Reservoir Community Partners is NOT developing 50% affordable.

"50%" only comes about by Reservoir Community Partners taking undeserved credit for an additional 187 units that would be paid for with public monies, as confirmed by the BOS Budget Analyst's Fiscal Responsibility and Feasibility Report.

Please vote NO on the staff's Resolution to initiate the GPA.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING ELEMENT

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan's Housing Element proposed 425-500 units. This number is eliminated in the GPA to allow for the proposed 1100+ units.

- The BPS Area Plan's figure of 500 units took into account the limited roadway network in the Reservoir area. Even with proposed mitigations in the EIR, the Reservoir vicinity will be unable to sustain the doubling of units from the BPS Area Plan's 500 units to the Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's 1100 units. The Reservoir Project's True Believers, with ideological blinders, just wish away the problem.

Planning Dept Staff asserts in its documents that the current PUC Reservoir bulk-height zoning is 40-X and 65-A. THIS IS FACTUALLY INCORRECT.

The adoption of the BPS Area Plan included the rezoning/upzoning of the PUC Reservoir to 40-X (NOT 65 ft. as the GPA erroneously presents--see attached Zoning Map for proof). As shown in the Zoning Map, the 65-A zoning applies **solely** to the CCSF Reservoir; not to PUC Reservoir.

AMENDMENTS TO OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The maps contained in the General Plan and BPS Area Plan show open space taking up at least **50% and up to 90%** of the 17.6 acre PUC Reservoir.

The GPA shrinks it down a fraction: a 2-acre Reservoir Park (2 acre park /17.6 acre plot = **11%**), but with an additional 2 acres of privately-owned publicly-accessible open space. Please refer to attached maps of General Plan, BPS Area Plan, and GPA.

The BPS Area Plan's Policy 5.1.1 description of Open Space for the Reservoir is removed in its entirety. Privatization is not a good reason to eliminate this section in its entirety.

BOTTOM-LINE:

The Reservoir Community Partners development has been deceptively marketed as a "50% affordable" project. The facts tell otherwise.

The essence of the General Plan Amendment is to facilitate the privatization of public land. Please do not intitate the GPA. Keep public land in public hands. VOTE NO TO STEALTH PRIVATIZATION.

Submitted by:

Alvin Ja, District 7

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1335 Grant Avenue Barbary Coast North Beach Dispensary
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:37:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: mariaalicia007 <maria.bugarin7@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2020 7:40 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1335 Grant Avenue Barbary Coast North Beach Dispensary

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

April 24, 2000

To whom it may concern,

I have been working with the homeless and the elderly for many years in North Beach. Many of the people I work with are handicapped and face other medical issues. Their challenges are often alleviated by medical marijuana.

For this reason alone, the new dispensary at 1335 Grant Avenue would be a significant and positive contribution to the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Mary Bugarin
338 Lombard St.

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1021 Valencia Street Environmental Review
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 10:36:00 AM

Josephine O. Feliciano

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our award-winning [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. Similarly, the [Board of Appeals](#) and [Board of Supervisors](#) are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. [Click here for more information.](#)

From: Risa Teitelbaum <risat@pacbell.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2020 5:06 PM
To: Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Clarke, Colin (CPC) <Colin.Clarke@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1021 Valencia Street Environmental Review

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

The project proposed for [1021 Valencia Street](#) must be denied for its numerous negative environmental impacts.

The site is within the Liberty Hill Historic district. The existing architecturally significant building was built in 1922 and is a contributing feature of the historic Valencia streetscape.

Every project built adds to increasing energy consumption with cumulative dire effects on the climate and accelerated global warming. The single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions is the burning of fossil fuels for electricity, heating, and transport. A building of this height, bulk and density, and the market it is intended to serve, will have significant negative effects on our environment.

The disproportionate height will cause extreme shadowing on buildings and apartments both adjacent and across from this 75 foot tall structure. Most, if not all, of these apartments are rent controlled and occupied by tenants of limited means. Shadowing results in the need for more indoor lighting and heating. The increased fuel needed to make up for the lack of sunlight creates a financial hardship while also exacerbating global warming.

The number of dwelling units creates a density that is without merit. Density is neither safe nor healthy regardless of political spin. The current pandemic clearly points out the negative health impacts of density.

Resource use in general will be significantly increased. Statistically, more water, more fuel, more energy transmission, and more resources are consumed by the up market ("market rate") demographic this building aims to serve compared to average. The consumption by the tenants of the 24 units proposed will be a tremendous increase from the resources presently consumed.

Open space is clearly not planned for this project. A roof deck is not a substitute recreation for families. More often than not, roof decks create noise pollution, affecting neighbors proximate and distant. Disruption to sleep, work, and the loss of one's right to quiet enjoyment of their dwelling is

an all too common side effect of roof decks. Although noise is a fact of city life, we should not deliberately plan to create a new and unhealthy problem.

Possibly the greatest hazard and environmental degradation will come from the increased traffic this building will attract and demand. Everything from ride hailing services, delivery cars and trucks, and repair and sanitation vehicles will be perpetually stopping and double parking on Valencia Street to service the proposed building and tenants. Increased air pollution from idling vehicles, the inevitable congestion, and lack of safe egress will negatively impact Valencia Street, drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians alike.

As an example of just one negative vehicular impact: 44,000 to 50,000 additional ride hailing cars come into San Francisco daily on a normal basis, routinely traveling great distances to get here and cruise the city for hours as they compete for fares.

Furthermore, do not think for a minute that these residents will not own cars. At least 50 percent of them will, based on recent reports on “car free” buildings. These new residents will then be cruising the streets looking for non-existent parking. This adds to even more fossil fuel use and increases local atmospheric pollution.

Societal impacts of this project are significant and negative. There is absolutely no need for more “market rate” apartments at a time where there are between 5,000 and 7,000 “market rate” units listed for rent in San Francisco. All indications are that the current pandemic will decrease the demand for such units. The need in this city is for affordable housing, something this project is not planning for.

The negative impacts of this proposed project span environmental, sociological, political and health issues. Displacement, apparent ageism, and anti-family design all combine to lead one to conclude that this development is beneficial only to the developers and the politicians who are in their pockets. There is a direct correlation between the gentrification this type of building exemplifies and the human crisis on our streets. This focus on maximizing developer profit rather than constructing affordable housing is one of the reasons that homeless encampments in our city neighborhoods degrade our environment with their generally unsafe, unhealthy, and unsanitary conditions. Our environment is being destroyed by the resource concentration and consumption that this proposal exemplifies. The social damage is collateral. This building should not be built.

Respectfully yours,

Risa Teitelbaum

[10 Hill Street](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1335 Grant Avenue Barbary Coast North Beach
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:40:18 AM

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 <<http://www.sfplanning.org/>>

On 4/25/20, 7:30 AM, "mariaalicia007" <maria.bugarin7@gmail.com> wrote:

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

April 24, 2000

Dear Mr. Ionin,

I have been working with the homeless and the elderly for many years in North Beach. Many of the people I work with are handicapped and face other medical issues. Their challenges are often alleviated by medical marijuana.

For this reason alone, the new dispensary at 1335 Grant Avenue would be a significant and positive contribution to the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Mary Bugarin
338 Lombard St.
San Francisco 94133

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Barbary Coast North Beach
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:39:56 AM

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: Greg Sullivan <greg@afar.com>
Date: Saturday, April 25, 2020 at 12:16 PM
To: "Hicks, Bridget (CPC)" <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Barbary Coast North Beach

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

I have owned my home at 22 Napier Lane on Telegraph Hill since 2006. I am writing in support of the Barbary Coast North Beach's application for a dispensary at 1335 Grant. I'm familiar with one of the principals and I'm very confident that they will run a responsible operation. I think this will benefit our neighborhood and the citizenry.

Count me as an enthusiastic supporter.

Best regards,

Greg

Greg Sullivan | Co-founder | **AFAR** Media | +1.602.625.7747

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: North beach dispensary
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:39:28 AM

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 <<http://www.sfplanning.org/>>

On 4/25/20, 6:03 PM, "Molly Cabe" <mollycabe@gmail.com> wrote:

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

Hi Jonas,

I'm writing with my support of the North Beach dispensary up for decision shortly.

As a resident on the Filbert steps I'm happy to see an option come to the neighborhood to fit with our walking lifestyle.

The work Kathy Dooley has done to keep the plan informed by the community makes me confident it will be a positive addition.

Thanks for your time,
Molly

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: North Beach dispensary
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:38:32 AM

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: Megan Kennedy <megan.mckennedy@gmail.com>
Date: Sunday, April 26, 2020 at 6:44 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: North Beach dispensary

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Megan Kennedy** <megan.mckennedy@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Apr 26, 2020 at 6:42 PM
Subject: Fwd: North Beach dispensary
To: jonas.jonin@sfgov.org <jonas.jonin@sfgov.org>

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in support for the Barbary Coast North Beach dispensary to be opened at 1331/1335 Grant St.

I work in healthcare, specifically in oncology at UCSF. I see many of my patients that are able to achieve symptom management and/or relief from cannabis products. Having a dispensary as a nearby option would be a benefit to many of our neighbors.

Financially, I would expect that the dispensary would contribute back to the neighborhood, which would provide much opportunity. Supporting a locally owned and operated dispensary and avoiding

support of other outside investors who haven't devoted time in or lived in this neighborhood is most ideal in protecting North Beach's values.

This dispensary will likely bring more foot traffic that would otherwise not be there. We all know Grant St as well as our neighborhood is filled with local stores and restaurants that would benefit from increased exposure and support.

Kindly consider approving Barbary Coast North Beach as I believe it will be an integral and vital part of the future of North Beach.

Sincerely
Megan Kennedy

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:37:37 AM

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: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Reply-To: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Date: Sunday, April 26, 2020 at 5:15 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

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

Commissioners:

FYI--

Alvin Ja

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
To: Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; Lutenski Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>
Cc: Norman Yee <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low BOS <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Erica Maybaum <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; Ivy Lee <ivylee@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2020, 5:07:32 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

Jon, Leigh:

Please ensure that all my written submissions are entered on the CAC website. It's unfair to exclude my alternative analyses from public view as they have been in the past.

Thanks,
aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

To: BRCAC ECN <brcac@sfgov.org>; Amy O'Hair <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>; Michael Ahrens <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>; Maurice Rivers <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>; "bdavila@ccsf.edu" <bdavila@ccsf.edu>; "rmuehlbauer@live.com" <rmuehlbauer@live.com>; marktang.cac@gmail.com <marktang.cac@gmail.com>; Christine Godinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>; Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; Lutenski Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>; peter.tham@ltgroupe.com <peter.tham@ltgroupe.com>; Erica Maybaum <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; "sna-brc@googlegroups.com" <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>

Cc: Norman Yee <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low BOS <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2020, 6:57:13 AM PDT

Subject: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

BRCAC, Board of Supervisors:

The Material for 4/27 /2020 CAC meeting includes "Responses from sponsor on DSG."

One of the responses stated :

"RCP references a CCSF commissioned study by Fehr and Peers (March 2019). This study reports on parking counts conducted in June of 2018 and the first week of the semester in August of 2018. Based on these surveys and a consideration of CCSF growth, the current parking need is projected at ~220 spaces.

- CHERRY-PICKING OF THE 220 FIGURE

Reservoir Community Partners has presented a cherry-picked "Unmet Parking Demand" for "2026, with core TDM" of 220 spaces.

RCP has used the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document to minimize the Reservoir Project's responsibility to mitigate harms to the City College community.

The data from the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document was cherry-picked. The facts have been fixed around the policy, like the "facts" that were used to justify the Iraq War.

In actuality, the CCSF TDM document referenced by RCP/Planning Dept Staff provided 3 scenarios for unmet parking demand for "2026, with core TDM":

1. Scenario 1: Parking Demand with PAEC

2. Scenario 2: Parking Demand with Balboa Reservoir Housing Project
3. Scenario 3: Parking Demand with PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project

Planning Dept Staff has cherry-picked in two ways.

First of all, the 220 figure comes from Scenario 2, in which PAEC is left out. This non-PAEC figure is used by Planning Dept Staff despite the Reservoir Team's continual and deceptive assurances that future CCSF needs and plans would be accounted for.

Secondly, the 220 figure for the PAEC-excluded Scenario 2 is just the low-ball figure of a range. The upper figure of that range is 1,007 spaces:

"to accommodate the peak demand at 11:00 AM, by 2026 the removal of the Lower Reservoir parking facilities would lead to a shortfall of 614 to 1,540 parking spaces during the 11 :00AM hour. If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 220 to 1,007 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 34)

If Planning Dept Staff and RCP were to be sincere about upholding and preserving City College interests, Scenario 3--*not Scenario 2*--would be used in assessing unmet demand.

Scenario 3 (PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project) reflects the future more accurately than Planning Dept Staff's cherry-picked Scenario 2. "Unserved Demand" for "2026, with core TDM", Table 14 shows 980 spaces (Typical Day) and 1,767 spaces (Peak Day):

"If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 980 to 1,767 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 35)

The pronouncements by the Reservoir Team (RCP/Planning/OEWD) need to be regarded with skepticism because much of what they present is skewed for easy and unthinking consumption by those who don't read the fine print--which is almost everybody!

I urge CAC to open your eyes to how you are being duped with cherry-picked "facts."

Say no to privatization of public land.

Sincerely,

aj

•

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sierra Club letter Opposing 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements, Code Amendments
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:37:09 AM
Attachments: [4-24-2020 OPPOSE CEQA SER Policy.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 <<http://www.sfplanning.org/>>

On 4/26/20, 5:53 PM, "Feinstein Arthur" <arthurfeinstein@earthlink.net> wrote:

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Please find attached a letter from the Sierra Club Opposing 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements, Code Amendments.

yours,
Arthur Feinstein, chair
Sierra Club California Conservation Committee
Sierra Club SF Bay Chapter Executive Committee member

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 4/27/2020 CAC comment on Item 4 Transportation
Date: Monday, April 27, 2020 9:36:22 AM

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: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Reply-To: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Date: Sunday, April 26, 2020 at 6:38 PM

To: "BRCAC (ECN)" <brcac@sfgov.org>, Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>, "sunnyside.balboa.reservoir" <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>, Brigitte Davila <bdavila@ccsf.edu>, rmuehlbauer <rmuehlbauer@live.com>, jumpstreet1983 <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>, "marktang.cac@gmail.com" <marktang.cac@gmail.com>, cgodinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>, Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>, mikeahrens5 <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>

Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "Board of Supervisors, (BOS)" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee@sfgov.org>, "Low, Jen (BOS)" <jen.low@sfgov.org>, "Maybaum, Erica (BOS)" <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>, SNA BRC <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>

Subject: 4/27/2020 CAC comment on Item 4 Transportation

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

BRCAC:

Review of Transportation improvements is on your agenda on 4/27/2020.

I ask you to review the Preamble to Principles & Parameters from several years ago:

Separate from these Parameters, we also want to highlight three key areas of overall importance and priority for us: transportation and neighborhood congestion, City College, and affordable housing. To be successful, any project will need to effectively integrate these priorities into their proposal. - Transportation and Neighborhood Congestion: Traffic congestion and the availability of street parking are already major problems facing the local community. No development proposal is likely to garner community support if it would worsen these conditions. - City College: The community cares deeply about City College's long-term health and growth. We are especially concerned that the Balboa Reservoir development will displace a surface parking lot currently utilized by City College students. It will be critical for the Balboa Reservoir developer to work with City College to address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise students' ability to access their education.

The latest iteration of of the Reservoir Community Partners and Planning Staff's plan is for providing 220 parking spaces in lieu of the 1,007 that will be taken away.

As I have shown in a separate 4/25 submission, this 220 figure had been cherry-picked. The 220 figure does not account for City College's PAEC and STEAM buildings.

If PAEC had been accounted for, the figure would have been a range of 980 to 1,767 spaces, instead of 220.

And even if PAEC were to be illegitimately excluded, still "*there would be unserved demand for around 220 to 1,007 parking spaces during the peak hour.*" (Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM, page 34). You can see that "220" is a cherry-picked low-ball figure.

Finally, I ask you to review my June 2019 submission to BRCAC for a big-picture perspective on transportation:

(from 6/10/2019)
BRCAC:

You will be presented with the CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM at your 6/10/2019 meeting.

The CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM Plan & Study is but one aspect of the overall Balboa Area TDM Plan that was initiated to address the impact of the Reservoir Project.

The following is a written comment that was submitted to BRCAC and Reservoir Community Partners, LLC (Avalon/Bridge) back in July of last year. The written comment was my critique based on the actual content of:

- Nelson/Nygaard TDM Framework
- Nelson/Nygaard Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report
- Reservoir Community Partners, LLC Base Plan
- AECOM Transportation Analysis
- SFCTA Prop K Grant for "Balboa Area TDM Study"
- NAIOP/Haas School of Business Golden Shovel Challenge: "Westwood Terrace in Balboa Park"
- May 2016 CCSF Facilities Planning Survey on Transportation & Parking
- Sunshine Ordinance document: 2014 email from Jeremy Shaw of Planning Dept to AECOM Transportation Analyst

--aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Shanahan Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>; balrescacchair@gmail.com

Cc: balboareservoir@gmail.com <balboareservoir@gmail.com>; Joe Kirchofer <joe_kirchofer@avalonbay.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 7, 2018, 9:35:50 AM PDT

Subject: additional comment for 7/9/2018 BRCAC Transportation meeting

BRCAC:

A few days ago I had sent you a Written Comment on Transportation that cited a UCB Haas School of Business "Westwood Terrace" study/ proposal.

The Written Comment quoted "Key Challenges" from that study proposal. I urge you to examine how the Reservoir Project has addressed those "Key Challenges" --in particular:

2. As the largest student parking area on-campus, preservation of parking capacity on the Balboa Reservoir is a focal point for both the City College and the local community.

3.

Due to limited access points and large influx of new residents, traffic impact and flow is a primary concern for the project.

The Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's (Avalon-Bridge) Base Plan shows motor vehicle access at two points: Lee Avenue (Whole Foods exit) and North Street (adjacent to Riordan High). This confirms the Haas Business School study's observation of "limited access points and large influx of new residents."

Yet the Reservoir Project's solution has been TDM and Residential Permit Parking which is totally deficient in addressing a "Key Challenge."

To refresh your memory, please consider and review the following (from an earlier submission regarding the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework) for your Transportation discussion:

The main significance of the TDM Framework is that it functions as a means for the Reservoir Project to avoid its responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts:

**INHERENT INEQUITY IN THE BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK:
DUMPING THE BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO
MITIGATE ITS ADVERSE IMPACTS ONTO ITS VICTIMS**

CEQA principles call for new projects like the Balboa Reservoir Project to mitigate adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Being a public service, City College has CEQA standing as an "environmental factor" that would require the proposed Reservoir Project to mitigate its adverse impacts.

From the very beginning of the Reservoir Project's public engagement process, CCSF stakeholders have complained about the adverse impacts on student enrollment and attendance that would be generated by the Project's eviction of existing student parking.

GENESIS OF BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK STUDY

In order to assuage community concerns regarding parking and traffic, the Reservoir Project initiated the Balboa Area TDM Study.

People in the community were expecting the study to be an all-around and objective analysis of transportation issues. What people in the community did not realize was that the TDM Study's general conclusions had already been pre-ordained.

The Balboa Area TDM Study had been given its marching orders:

"The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents."

WILLFUL DISREGARD FOR HARD DATA

The City Agencies have managed the Reservoir Project in a manner similar to how the Iraq War had been promoted. Just like the Iraq War in which, according to British Intelligence's Downing Street Memo, "... the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy", the recommendations and conclusions

of the Nelson-Nygaard study have been fixed around the pre-determined TDM policy.

The Balboa Area TDM Framework has been fixed..... with willful disregard for the hard data from surveys that would refute the pre-determined TDM dogma.

WILLFUL EXCLUSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PARKING ASSESSMENT Sunshine Ordinance documents reveal the following:

In 2014, the AECOM Transportation Analyst had proposed performing a comprehensive supply & demand assessment for all on-street and off-street parking in the neighboring vicinities. Jeremy Shaw of the Planning Dept put a stop to AECOM's proposal to perform this comprehensive assessment.

Instead, in a 2014 email to the AECOM Transportation Analyst, Planning Dept told AECOM to confine their study to the Reservoir parking lots alone:

"...edits made in the attached word document reflect the current thinking in SF transportation analysis..."

"Comment [JS4]: We'd recommend just looking at the [Balboa Reservoir parking lots--aj] parking lots. --- Off-site parking analysis is nice to have. But really we want to focus the effort on what will drive the on-site design and what kind of trips that design will generate – rather than worry about off-site impacts and mitigations..."

So from the very beginning, starting with the AECOM Existing Conditions' Transportation Analysis, a full and objective assessment and analysis had already been stopped in its tracks by the Reservoir Project Staff.

"THE CURRENT THINKING IN SF TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS"
What was--and is--the "current thinking?".....The thinking is: **Don't "worry about off-site impacts and mitigations."**

MANIPULATION AND BIAS IN CITY'S SURVEY OF CITY COLLEGE PARKING

The Reservoir Project's data collection was deliberately skewed to minimize apparent parking demand at City College. It did this by collecting PM data from 10 pm to 12:30 am when no classes are in session. From the Reservoir Project's Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report: *"The surveys were conducted during two periods; midday, between 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; and late evening, between 10:00 PM to 12:30 AM."*

Why would a parking survey be performed between 10pm and 12:30am when any fool could tell you that the CCSF parking lot would be empty?

DELIBERATELY OBSCURED: CONTEXT OF RESERVOIR BEING A NEW PROJECT

The TDM Study was a response to community concerns about transportation issues that would be generated by the new Reservoir Project that would impact the existing setting of City College and the surrounding neighborhoods.

The TDM Framework obscures this context by placing the new Reservoir Project on an equal footing with City College and the surrounding neighborhoods. The Balboa Area TDM Framework delineates three sub-areas: 1) City College Ocean Campus, 2) Balboa Reservoir , and 3) Balboa Area neighborhoods.

The TDM Framework fails to acknowledge the fact that the Balboa Reservoir sub-area, as a new proposed project, is responsible for mitigation of its adverse impacts. Instead, the TDM Framework presents the Reservoir Project as a fact-on-the-ground with importance equal to--if not greater than--City College and the neighborhoods.

THROWN OVERBOARD: STUDENT INTERESTS OF ACCESS TO EDUCATION

By putting the Reservoir Project on equal footing with City College and the neighborhoods, the Reservoir Project has been, with a sleight-of-hand, absolved of its CEQA responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Instead, mitigation has been dumped onto the Reservoir Project's victims. Instead of the Reservoir Project being held responsible for providing replacement parking for students, City College's FMP has had to respond by proposing new parking structures on SFCCD property....but with no realistic funding sources for such structures necessitated by eviction of student parking.

INEQUITY IN BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK

Page 18 of the TDM Framework has a section entitled "Parking availability." The section brings up Balboa Park Station and City College as mahor trip generators. The section says that concerns have been expressed about parking during class times. **Yet this "Parking availability" section pointedly avoids any mention whatsoever of the impact of 2,200 new residents in a new residential project projected to contain about 550 parking spaces!**

On page 25, the TDM Framework has set up car-use reduction targets for the City College students and employees, and for the new Reservoir residents. It has also proposed Residential Permit Parking for the neighborhoods:

- The target for City College is **20%**.
 - According to Figure 4 "Current and Recommended Mode Split, CCSF's Ocean Campus", the TDM Framework calls for student drivers be cut back from 35% to 20% (a reduction of 43%).
 - The TDM Framework calls for CCSF employee drivers to be cut back from 45% to 20% (a reduction of 56%).
- The TDM Framework sets an initial car use target for new Balboa Reservoir residents to be **60%**.
 - In comparison, CCSF student car use is already down to **35%**and CCSF employee car use is already down to **45%**. Further cuts to 20% mean that **CCSF students and employees are being expected to sacrifice access to City College in**

order to benefit new Reservoir residents.

- The TDM Framework has called for neighborhood residents to initiate Residential Permit Parking to mitigate spillover parking generated by students who will no longer be able to park in the Reservoir and to discourage new Reservoir residents to park in the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - This is another shameless example of dumping mitigation responsibilities onto the victims of the Reservoir Project instead of the new Project taking responsibility for its own adverse impacts.

OVERARCHING GOALS

The TDM Framework sets up 4 overarching goals:

1. Reduce vehicle-miles traveled
2. Reduce auto trips
3. Reduce traffic congestion
4. Reduce transportation costs to preserve housing affordability

FALSE EQUIVALENCE: REDUCING CAR USE vs. STUDENT ACCESS

Conspicuously missing from the list of overarching goals is: ENSURING STUDENT ACCESS TO EDUCATION. Other than providing Orwellian vacuous and perfunctory talk about “*the importance of accessible education and striv[ing] to establish equitable transportation choices...*” the TDM Framework proffers no realistic or effective solution to the priorities shown to be important to CCSF stakeholders in data collected in the CCSF Transportation Survey.

Hard data from the survey shows that “Reducing Travel Time” and “Arriving on Time” are overwhelmingly the most important considerations in choosing transportation mode.

CONFLATING MEANS WITH ENDS: THE OVERARCHING IMPORTANCE OF THE DESTINATION

A fundamental flaw of the TDM Framework is that it only treats the issue of reducing car usage in isolation.

It should not take a lot of smarts to realize that transportation is an issue only when there’s a destination involved. Lacking a desired destination, transportation and parking are a non-issues.

The TDM Framework fails to recognize the fact that transportation is just a way to get to a desired destination. Instead, it dogmatically asserts that parking in and of itself generates traffic.

TDM FRAMEWORK: SPEAR-CARRIER AND PROPAGANDA FOR BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT

The Nelson-Nygaard TDM documents serve as spearhead documents to

advocate for the interests of the Balboa Reservoir Project, NOT for the interests of City College stakeholders or for the neighborhoods.

The main significance of the TDM Framework is that it functions as a means for the Reservoir Project to avoid its responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts.

-

From: [aj](#)
To: [BRCAC \(ECN\)](#); [Jon Winston](#); [sunnyside.balboa.reservoir](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); [rmuehlbauer](#); [jumpstreet1983](#); [marktang.cac@gmail.com](#); [cgodinez](#); [Peter Tham](#); [mikeahrens5](#)
Cc: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Maybaum, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [SNA BRC](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 4/27/2020 CAC comment on Item 4 Transportation
Date: Sunday, April 26, 2020 6:38:57 PM

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

BRCAC:

Review of Transportation improvements is on your agenda on 4/27/2020.

I ask you to review the Preamble to Principles & Parameters from several years ago:

Separate from these Parameters, we also want to highlight three key areas of overall importance and priority for us: transportation and neighborhood congestion, City College, and affordable housing. To be successful, any project will need to effectively integrate these priorities into their proposal. - Transportation and Neighborhood Congestion: Traffic congestion and the availability of street parking are already major problems facing the local community. No development proposal is likely to garner community support if it would worsen these conditions. - City College: The community cares deeply about City College's long-term health and growth. We are especially concerned that the Balboa Reservoir development will displace a surface parking lot currently utilized by City College students. It will be critical for the Balboa Reservoir developer to work with City College to address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise students' ability to access their education.

The latest iteration of of the Reservoir Community Partners and Planning Staff's plan is for providing 220 parking spaces in lieu of the 1,007 that will be taken away.

As I have shown in a separate 4/25 submission, this 220 figure had been cherry-picked. The 220 figure does not account for City College's PAEC and STEAM buildings.

If PAEC had been accounted for, the figure would have been a range of 980 to 1,767 spaces, instead of 220.

And even if PAEC were to be illegitimately excluded, still "*there would be unserved demand for around 220 to 1,007 parking spaces during the peak hour.*" (Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM, page 34). You can see that "220" is a cherry-picked low-ball figure.

Finally, I ask you to review my June 2019 submission to BRCAC for a big-picture perspective on transportation:

(from 6/10/2019)

BRCAC:

You will be presented with the CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM at your 6/10/2019 meeting.

The CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM Plan & Study is but one aspect of the overall Balboa Area TDM Plan that was initiated to address the impact of the Reservoir Project.

The following is a written comment that was submitted to BRCAC and Reservoir Community Partners, LLC (Avalon/Bridge) back in July of last year. The written comment was my critique based on the actual content of:

- Nelson/Nygaard TDM Framework
- Nelson/Nygaard Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report
- Reservoir Community Partners, LLC Base Plan
- AECOM Transportation Analysis
- SFCTA Prop K Grant for "Balboa Area TDM Study"
- NAIOP/Haas School of Business Golden Shovel Challenge: "Westwood Terrace in Balboa Park"
- May 2016 CCSF Facilities Planning Survey on Transportation & Parking
- Sunshine Ordinance document: 2014 email from Jeremy Shaw of Planning Dept to AECOM Transportation Analyst

--aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Shanahan Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>; balrescacchair@gmail.com

Cc: balboareservoir@gmail.com <balboareservoir@gmail.com>; Joe Kirchofer <joe_kirchofer@avalonbay.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 7, 2018, 9:35:50 AM PDT

Subject: additional comment for 7/9/2018 BRCAC Transportation meeting

BRCAC:

A few days ago I had sent you a Written Comment on Transportation that cited a UCB Haas School of Business "Westwood Terrace" study/ proposal.

The Written Comment quoted "Key Challenges" from that study proposal. I urge you to examine how the Reservoir Project has addressed those "Key Challenges" --in particular:

2. As the largest student parking area on-campus, preservation of parking capacity on the Balboa Reservoir is a focal point for both the City College and the local community.

3.
Due to limited access points and large influx of new residents, traffic impact and flow is a primary concern for the project.

The Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's (Avalon-Bridge) Base Plan shows motor vehicle access at two points: Lee Avenue (Whole Foods exit) and North Street (adjacent to Riordan High). This confirms the Haas Business School study's observation of "limited access points and large influx of new residents."

Yet the Reservoir Project's solution has been TDM and Residential Permit Parking which is totally deficient in addressing a "Key Challenge."

To refresh your memory, please consider and review the following (from an earlier submission regarding the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework) for your Transportation discussion:

The main significance of the TDM Framework is that it functions as a means for the Reservoir Project to avoid its responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts:

**INHERENT INEQUITY IN THE BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK:
DUMPING THE BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO
MITIGATE ITS ADVERSE IMPACTS ONTO ITS VICTIMS**

CEQA principles call for new projects like the Balboa Reservoir Project to mitigate adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Being a public service, City College has CEQA standing as an "environmental factor" that would require the proposed Reservoir Project to mitigate its adverse impacts.

From the very beginning of the Reservoir Project's public engagement process, CCSF stakeholders have complained about the adverse impacts on student enrollment and attendance that would be generated by the Project's eviction of existing student parking.

GENESIS OF BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK STUDY

In order to assuage community concerns regarding parking and traffic, the Reservoir Project initiated the Balboa Area TDM Study.

People in the community were expecting the study to be an all-around and objective analysis of transportation issues. What people in the community did not realize was that the TDM Study's general conclusions had already been pre-ordained.

The Balboa Area TDM Study had been given its marching orders:

"The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents."

WILLFUL DISREGARD FOR HARD DATA

The City Agencies have managed the Reservoir Project in a manner similar to how the Iraq War had been promoted. Just like the Iraq War in which, according to British Intelligence's Downing Street Memo, "... *the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy*", the recommendations and conclusions of the Nelson-Nygaard study have been fixed around the pre-determined TDM policy.

The Balboa Area TDM Framework has been fixed..... with willful disregard for the hard data from surveys that would refute the pre-determined TDM dogma.

WILLFUL EXCLUSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PARKING ASSESSMENT

Sunshine Ordinance documents reveal the following:

In 2014, the AECOM Transportation Analyst had proposed performing a comprehensive supply & demand assessment for all on-street and off-street parking in the neighboring vicinities. Jeremy Shaw of the Planning Dept put a stop to AECOM's proposal to perform this comprehensive assessment.

Instead, in a 2014 email to the AECOM Transportation Analyst, Planning Dept told AECOM to confine their study to the Reservoir parking lots alone:

"...edits made in the attached word document reflect the current thinking in SF transportation analysis..."

"Comment [JS4]: We'd recommend just looking at the [Balboa Reservoir parking lots--aj] parking lots. --- Off-site parking analysis is nice to have. But really we want to focus the effort on what will drive the on-site design and what kind of trips that design will generate – rather than worry about off-site impacts and mitigations..."

So from the very beginning, starting with the AECOM Existing Conditions' Transportation Analysis, a full and objective assessment and analysis had already been stopped in its tracks by the Reservoir Project Staff.

"THE CURRENT THINKING IN SF TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS"

What was--and is--the "current thinking?".....The thinking is: **Don't "worry about off-site impacts and mitigations."**

MANIPULATION AND BIAS IN CITY'S SURVEY OF CITY COLLEGE PARKING

The Reservoir Project's data collection was deliberately skewed to minimize apparent parking demand at City College. It did this by collecting PM data from 10 pm to 12:30 am when no classes are in session. From the Reservoir Project's Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report: *"The surveys were conducted during two periods; midday, between 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; and late evening, between 10:00 PM to 12:30 AM."*

Why would a parking survey be performed between 10pm and 12:30am when any fool could tell you that the CCSF parking lot would be empty?

DELIBERATELY OBSCURED: CONTEXT OF RESERVOIR BEING A NEW PROJECT

The TDM Study was a response to community concerns about transportation issues that would be generated by the new Reservoir Project that would impact the existing setting of City College and the surrounding neighborhoods.

The TDM Framework obscures this context by placing the new Reservoir Project on an equal footing with City College and the surrounding neighborhoods. The Balboa Area TDM Framework delineates three sub-areas: 1) City College Ocean Campus, 2) Balboa Reservoir , and 3) Balboa Area neighborhoods.

The TDM Framework fails to acknowledge the fact that the Balboa Reservoir sub-area, as a new proposed project, is responsible for mitigation of its adverse impacts. Instead, the TDM Framework presents the Reservoir Project as a fact-on-the-ground with importance equal to--if not greater than--City College and the neighborhoods.

THROWN OVERBOARD: STUDENT INTERESTS OF ACCESS TO EDUCATION

By putting the Reservoir Project on equal footing with City College and the neighborhoods, the Reservoir Project has been, with a sleight-of-hand, absolved of its CEQA responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Instead, mitigation has been dumped onto the Reservoir Project's victims. Instead of the Reservoir Project being held responsible for providing replacement parking for students, City College's FMP has had to respond by proposing new parking structures on SFCCD property.....but with no realistic funding sources for such structures necessitated by eviction of student parking.

INEQUITY IN BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK

Page 18 of the TDM Framework has a section entitled "Parking availability." The section brings up Balboa Park Station and City College as mahor trip generators. The section says that concerns have been expressed about parking during class times. **Yet this "Parking availability" section pointedly**

avoids any mention whatsoever of the impact of 2,200 new residents in a new residential project projected to contain about 550 parking spaces!

On page 25, the TDM Framework has set up car-use reduction targets for the City College students and employees, and for the new Reservoir residents. It has also proposed Residential Permit Parking for the neighborhoods:

- The target for City College is **20%**.
 - According to Figure 4 “Current and Recommended Mode Split, CCSF’s Ocean Campus”, the TDM Framework calls for student drivers be cut back from 35% to 20% (a reduction of 43%).
 - The TDM Framework calls for CCSF employee drivers to be cut back from 45% to 20% (a reduction of 56%).
- The TDM Framework sets an initial car use target for new Balboa Reservoir residents to be **60%**.
 - In comparison, CCSF student car use is already down to **35%** and CCSF employee car use is already down to **45%**. Further cuts to 20% mean that **CCSF students and employees are being expected to sacrifice access to City College in order to benefit new Reservoir residents.**
- The TDM Framework has called for neighborhood residents to initiate Residential Permit Parking to mitigate spillover parking generated by students who will no longer be able to park in the Reservoir and to discourage new Reservoir residents to park in the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - This is another shameless example of dumping mitigation responsibilities onto the victims of the Reservoir Project instead of the new Project taking responsibility for its own adverse impacts.

OVERARCHING GOALS

The TDM Framework sets up 4 overarching goals:

1. Reduce vehicle-miles traveled
2. Reduce auto trips
3. Reduce traffic congestion
4. Reduce transportation costs to preserve housing affordability

FALSE EQUIVALENCE: REDUCING CAR USE vs. STUDENT ACCESS

Conspicuously missing from the list of overarching goals is: **ENSURING STUDENT ACCESS TO EDUCATION**. Other than providing Orwellian vacuous and perfunctory talk about “*the importance of accessible education and striv[ing] to establish equitable transportation choices...*” the TDM Framework proffers no realistic or effective solution to the priorities shown to be important to CCSF stakeholders in data collected in the CCSF Transportation Survey.

Hard data from the survey shows that “Reducing Travel Time” and “Arriving on Time” are overwhelmingly the most important considerations in choosing transportation mode.

CONFLATING MEANS WITH ENDS: THE OVERARCHING IMPORTANCE OF THE DESTINATION

A fundamental flaw of the TDM Framework is that it only treats the issue of reducing car usage in isolation.

It should not take a lot of smarts to realize that transportation is an issue only when there's a destination involved. Lacking a desired destination, transportation and parking are a non-issues.

The TDM Framework fails to recognize the fact that transportation is just a way to get to a desired destination. Instead, it dogmatically asserts that parking in and of itself generates traffic.

TDM FRAMEWORK: SPEAR-CARRIER AND PROPAGANDA FOR BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT

The Nelson-Nygaard TDM documents serve as spearhead documents to advocate for the interests of the Balboa Reservoir Project, NOT for the interests of City College stakeholders or for the neighborhoods.

The main significance of the TDM Framework is that it functions as a means for the Reservoir Project to avoid its responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts.

-

From: [aj](#)
To: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces
Date: Sunday, April 26, 2020 5:15:03 PM

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

Commissioners:

FYI--

Alvin Ja

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
To: Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; Lutenski Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>
Cc: Norman Yee <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low BOS <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Erica Maybaum <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; Ivy Lee <ivylee@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2020, 5:07:32 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

Jon, Leigh:

Please ensure that all my written submissions are entered on the CAC website. It's unfair to exclude my alternative analyses from public view as they have been in the past.

Thanks,
aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
To: BRCAC ECN <brcac@sfgov.org>; Amy O'Hair <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>; Michael Ahrens <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>; Maurice Rivers <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>; "bdavila@ccsf.edu" <bdavila@ccsf.edu>; "rmuehlbauer@live.com" <rmuehlbauer@live.com>; marktang.cac@gmail.com <marktang.cac@gmail.com>; Christine Godinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>; Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; Lutenski Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>; peter.tham@ltgroupre.com <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>; Erica Maybaum <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; "sna-brc@googlegroups.com" <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>
Cc: Norman Yee <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low BOS <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2020, 6:57:13 AM PDT
Subject: Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

BRCAC, Board of Supervisors:

The Material for 4/27 /2020 CAC meeting includes "Responses from sponsor on DSG."

One of the responses stated :

"RCP references a CCSF commissioned study by Fehr and Peers (March 2019). This study reports on parking counts conducted in June of 2018 and the first week of the semester in August of 2018. Based on these surveys and a consideration of CCSF growth, the current parking need is projected at ~220 spaces.

- CHERRY-PICKING OF THE 220 FIGURE

Reservoir Community Partners has presented a cherry-picked "Unmet Parking Demand" for "2026, with core TDM" of 220 spaces.

RCP has used the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document to minimize the Reservoir Project's responsibility to mitigate harms to the City College community.

The data from the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document was cherry-picked. The facts have been fixed around the policy, like the "facts" that were used to justify the Iraq War.

In actuality, the CCSF TDM document referenced by RCP/Planning Dept Staff provided 3 scenarios for unmet parking demand for "2026, with core TDM":

1. Scenario 1: Parking Demand with PAEC
2. Scenario 2: Parking Demand with Balboa Reservoir Housing Project
3. Scenario 3: Parking Demand with PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project

Planning Dept Staff has cherry-picked in two ways.

First of all, the 220 figure comes from Scenario 2, in which PAEC is left out. This non-PAEC figure is used by Planning Dept Staff despite the Reservoir Team's continual and deceptive assurances that future CCSF needs and plans would be accounted for.

Secondly, the 220 figure for the PAEC-excluded Scenario 2 is just the low-ball figure of a range. The upper figure of that range is 1,007 spaces:

"to accommodate the peak demand at 11:00 AM, by 2026 the removal of the Lower Reservoir parking facilities would lead to a shortfall of 614 to 1,540 parking spaces during the 11 :00AM hour. If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 220 to 1,007 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 34)

If Planning Dept Staff and RCP were to be sincere about upholding and preserving City College interests, Scenario 3--*not Scenario 2*--would be used in assessing unmet demand.

Scenario 3 (PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project) reflects the future more accurately than Planning Dept Staff's cherry-picked Scenario 2. "Unserved Demand" for "2026, with core TDM", Table 14 shows **980** spaces (Typical Day) and 1,767 spaces (Peak Day):

"If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 980 to 1,767 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 35)

The pronouncements by the Reservoir Team (RCP/Planning/OEWD) need to be regarded with skepticism because much of what they present is skewed for easy and unthinking consumption by those who don't read the fine print--which is almost everybody!

I urge CAC to open your eyes to how you are being duped with cherry-picked "facts."

Say no to privatization of public land.

Sincerely,
aj

•

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: ***PRESS RELEASE*** MAYOR BREED ANNOUNCES NEIGHBORHOOD MINI-GRANTS TO SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESSES IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES
Date: Saturday, April 25, 2020 9:44:11 AM
Attachments: [04.24.20 Business Grants.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

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

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

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Friday, April 24, 2020 at 4:50 PM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: ***PRESS RELEASE*** MAYOR BREED ANNOUNCES NEIGHBORHOOD MINI-GRANTS TO SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESSES IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Friday, April 24, 2020

Contact: San Francisco Joint Information Center, 415-558-2712, dempres@sfgov.org

*****PRESS RELEASE*****

**MAYOR BREED ANNOUNCES NEIGHBORHOOD
MINI-GRANTS TO SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESSES IN
UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES**

Funding made available to over 300 businesses impacted by COVID-19

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London Breed and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) today announced nearly \$1 million in new funding for mini-grants to independently-owned and women-owned small businesses in underserved commercial corridors including the Bayview, Central Market Tenderloin, Excelsior, Japantown, Fillmore, Mission, and the Outer Mission Ingleside (OMI) neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Mini-Grants will provide \$1,000 - \$10,000 in grants for urgent economic relief for neighborhood-serving small businesses and women-owned businesses impacted by COVID-19.

“The Stay Home Order is critical to protecting public health, but we know it’s having a major impact on our workers and small businesses,” said Mayor Breed. “These businesses are suffering and need immediate help, and these grants can provide a measure of relief. But we

know there's much more that needs to be done, which is why today we had our first meeting of the Economic Recovery Task Force to plan for how can better support them now and over the coming weeks and months."

The Neighborhood Mini-Grants will provide financial support to family run businesses, owner operated businesses, entrepreneurs of color, women-owned businesses and other enterprises in historically underserved communities who may not have employees on payroll or have access to traditional capital. These businesses include salons, barbershops, flower shops, gift shops, independent contractors and many others that have been severely impacted by business closures or reduced operations due to COVID-19.

"Family owned and owner operated businesses in San Francisco are an essential and beloved part of our neighborhoods and they need our help now," said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Economic and Workforce Development. "These businesses provide an important foundation for many of our historically marginalized communities, and are a vital means of self-employment providing access to economic opportunity for women, communities of color and immigrant households. We are humbled to be in a position deliver them some relief."

OEWD worked closely with community-based organizations in opportunity neighborhoods across the City to reallocate existing City economic development funds to support COVID-19 relief efforts. Together, the City and partners, including the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, are committing nearly \$1 million in City funding to provide economic relief to over 300 businesses. In addition, some neighborhoods will be adding to these funds by leveraging private donations to support additional businesses.

"Our office has been working hard to negate the adverse impacts of this COVID-19 health crisis on our small businesses. Bayview's small businesses are the heart of our community and are being negatively impacted by this nightmarish pandemic," said Supervisor Shamann Walton. "This Phoenix Fund in the Bayview is a unique opportunity—specifically for Bayview small businesses—that will help mitigate the negative economic impacts for these community anchors. We will continue to work on strategies that will help our businesses survive this unprecedented hardship."

OEWD will work closely with community partners who will administer the grant, complete outreach and deliver the financial aid directly to qualifying businesses within these targeted areas. Community partners include the Excelsior Action Group, Mission Economic Development Agency, Economic Development on Third (EDOT), Renaissance Center for Entrepreneurs, Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, Japantown Taskforce and Community Benefits District (CBD), Tenderloin Community Benefits District (CBD), Outer Mission Merchants, and Northeast Federal Credit Union.

"The Excelsior Action Group grateful the City is reaching out to neighborhood organizations like ours. It speaks to the resiliency and flexibility of our community that we can redirect our current funding structure and provide the much needed and immediate financial support to our local businesses affected by COVID-19," said Maribel Ramirez with the Excelsior Action Group. "Each neighborhood is distinct, and by leveraging community partners who are uniquely equipped to understand their community needs, we will help to deepen the impact of city funds."

The Neighborhood Mini-Grants are intended to help recipients with necessary expenses

required to sustain their businesses during the acute disruption phase as they temporarily close or reduce their operations until the shelter in place is lifted. The funds may be used to support business expenses such as rent, payroll, and utilities or to supplement their income resulting from a direct loss of business revenue. Small businesses in these neighborhoods may see if they are eligible to apply at <https://sf.gov/apply-small-business-mini-grant>

The mini-grants are part of Mayor Breed's ongoing efforts to support small businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic. These initiatives to support small business include:

- Deferring business registration fees businesses totaling \$49 million for 89,000 businesses and further delaying the City's collection of the unified license fee until September 30, 2020. This will lead to \$14 million in deferrals impacting 11,000 payees. In March, Mayor Breed announced an initial three-month delay for the collection of the fee.
- Business tax deferrals for small businesses with up to \$10 million in gross receipts. Mayor Breed and Treasurer Cisneros notified small businesses that their first quarter businesses taxes can be deferred until February 2021. No interest payments, fees, or fines will accrue as a result of the deferral.
- \$10 million Workers and Families First Paid Sick Leave Program, providing up to 40 hours of paid sick leave per employee;
- \$9 million Emergency Loan Fund providing up to \$50,000 in zero interest loans for individual small businesses;
- \$2 million Resiliency Grants providing up to \$10,000 grants to over 200 small businesses;
- \$2.5 million in support for working artists and arts and cultural organizations financially impacted by COVID-19;
- Supporting nonprofits funded by the City so workers don't lose their incomes;
- Issuing a Moratorium on Commercial Evictions for small and medium sized businesses that can't afford to pay rent;
- Capping the commission at 15% on 3rd party food delivery companies;
- Advocating for additional resources for small business and workers through the federal CARES Act;
- Establishing City Philanthropic www.Give2SF.org Fund, where donations will support housing stabilization, food security, and financial security for workers and small businesses impacted by coronavirus;
- Launching a one stop City website for businesses and workers seeking resources, contacts, and updates during the COVID-19 emergency: www.oewd.org/covid19.

Earlier this month, Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee announced the creation of a COVID-19 Economic Recovery Task Force. The Task Force is charged with guiding the City's efforts to sustain and recover local businesses and employment, and mitigate the economic hardships that are already affecting the most vulnerable San Franciscans. Their work will support San Francisco organizations and individuals throughout the remainder of the Stay Home Order, and will lay the groundwork for economic recovery once the City has made meaningful progress containing COVID-19.

###

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#); [CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS](#); [STACY, KATE \(CAT\)](#); [YANG, AUSTIN \(CAT\)](#); [JENSEN, KRISTEN \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: CPC Calendars for April 30, 2020
Date: Friday, April 24, 2020 3:11:13 PM
Attachments: [Advance Calendar - 20200430.xlsx](#)
[20200430_cal.docx](#)
[20200430_cal.pdf](#)
[CPC Hearing Results 2020.docx](#)

Commissioners,

I wanted to commend all of you on your perseverance and attention during these remote hearings. I know how difficult it is.

I would like to acknowledge our first glitch free hearing! The transitions between presentations by staff, sponsors and DR requesters, and public comment were very smooth. I am relieved we didn't have any issues with the AT&T conference bridge line that plagued our first two hearings and continues to disrupt other Commission/Committee hearings. I believe this can be attributed to your staff in Commission Affairs (Christine, Chan and Josie) working hard behind the scenes during the hearing and preparing everyone prior to going live. Which bodes well for us. Doesn't look like we will be convening in City Hall anytime soon.

Finally, attached are you Calendars for April 30, 2020.

Cheers (grabbing a beer out of my fridge now),

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: [Adam Mayer](#)
To: [Perry, Andrew \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Subject: Lower Polk Neighbors: Support for 1580 Pacific Ave
Date: Friday, April 24, 2020 12:42:46 PM
Attachments: [20-04-24 LPN 1580 Pacific Support Letter.pdf](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Planning Department and Planning Commission,

Please see attached our support letter for the proposed project at 1580 Pacific Avenue (at Polk Street).

Best Regards,
Adam Mayer
Lower Polk Neighbors

--

Adam N. Mayer AIA, LEED AP BD+C
adam.n.mayer@gmail.com

From: [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Amy Lee; CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\); Hicks, Bridget \(CPC\); Conner, Kate \(CPC\); Koppel, Joel \(CPC\); Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\); Diamond, Susan \(CPC\); Fung, Frank \(CPC\); Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\); Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\); George Karamanos; Jenna ♥♥; Jonathan Pearlman](#)
Subject: Re: 4118 21st St - request for continuance
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2020 1:23:50 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-wicrhia.png](#)

Thank you, Amy. We appreciate this thoughtful note, and look forward to being in touch with you all following the Commission hearing today.
Thank you, and please stay well!

Jacob

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Amy Lee <amy@3ssanfrancisco.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 8:43:14 AM
To: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Conner, Kate (CPC) <kate.conner@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; George Karamanos <george.karamanos@gmail.com>; Jenna ♥♥ <jenna.b.karamanos@gmail.com>; Jonathan Pearlman <jonathan@elevationarchitects.com>
Subject: Re: 4118 21st St - request for continuance

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

Dear Jonas, Jacob, and Commissioners,

Respectfully, we must admit, that we are surprised to see this request from the Supervisor's office for a continuance. Given the extensive outreach and lack of issues raised since this new project was first sent to the neighbors back on January 13, 2020, we do not understand what a continuance would achieve.

We have worked diligently with Planning to transform an existing non-conforming SFH into a two-unit home that is contextually appropriate in the neighborhood and will add to the City's housing stock.

It is important to note that the Karamanos previously appeared before the Commission in August and September 2019, in which this family brought forward a single-family home that was disallowed based on a tied 2-2 vote not *on the project itself, but on our request for a*

continuance, where these very same neighbors opposed a continuance and engaged in bad faith last-minute false accusations.

In late December 2019, Planning Department, the Zoning Administrator, and the City Attorney all concluded that this new proposed project was substantially different and it need not wait the required year and it, therefore, was properly scheduled for April 23, 2020 Commission review.

Since then, and throughout this entire 24-month process, we have had more than 50 1:1 or small group meetings with neighbors. We have offered to meet with anyone and met with everyone that expressed interest in doing so. Moreover, we have made numerous significant revisions to the design, based on feedback we have received. Based on our ongoing good faith efforts to engage the community, many in the neighborhood are supportive, as reflected by the letters submitted to the Commission.

The current neighbors seeking a continuance have never responded to our offers to meet and have not provided any substantive objections to the project that have not already been responded to or resulted in design changes. Thus, we are not sure what a 30-day delay, or any delay, would accomplish. Nevertheless, we remain ready to meet with any and all neighbors, as we have been doing, over Zoom, or on the phone, at their convenience. We always have been and will make our architect and consultant available, if that helps.

If indeed a continuance is granted, we respectfully request that it be for no more than 2 weeks. Please do not continue the hearing longer than absolutely necessary to have these conversations – which we have been actively having for 24 months. The Karamanos are fully prepared to come before the Commission and view these few neighbors' last-minute request for a continuance as nothing more than a delaying tactic, especially when they have ignored our offers to meet with them and have raised no substantive comments on the design of the home.

The Karamanos family are eager to build their home for their growing family and parents. They would like to move forward with rebuilding their lives and are current members of the Noe Valley community, where they currently reside. As two working parents, they relied on the previous architect and unfortunately, this renovation started out poorly. He was hired as well to oversee the construction and failed to ensure that the construction proceeded within the scope of the approved permit. The situation was further exacerbated continual inspection approval by DBI. The Karamanos has suffered greatly, not only financially but personally. This project is completely code-compliant, and we have done everything we can to assuage the neighbors who were willing to talk with us. We are not sure what more could possibly be done.

We look forward to presenting the project to you sooner rather than later.

Best,

Amy



www.3ssanfrancisco.com

(415) 290-3051

From: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 1:28 PM

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

Cc: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Amy Lee <amy@3ssanfrancisco.com>; Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Conner, Kate (CPC) <kate.conner@sfgov.org>

Subject: 4118 21st St - request for continuance

Dear Jonas,

I'm writing to respectfully request a 30-day continuance of this item from tomorrow's hearing to May 21. We recognize that the project has been determined to be a substantially different project from what was denied last year and therefore has been properly agendaized at this time. However, given the high level of concern, confusion among the neighbors as to the review process for this new project, and the additional strain everyone is under in these extraordinary circumstances, we believe a continuance will give space for all parties to make their concerns known to the Commission, and to have additional time to understand the current plans and communicate further with the project team. I am including Amy Lee from the project team here as well.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and thank you so much for all your efforts to keep the Commission's business underway during this time. Thank you,

Jacob

Jacob Bintliff

Legislative Aide

Office of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 284
San Francisco, California 94102
(415) 554-7753 | jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

From: [Toyer Grear](#)
To: [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [theresa.imperial@sfgove.org](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Standard Environmental Requirements - Case Number: 2020-000052PCA. OPPOSE
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2020 10:56:03 AM
Attachments: [2020.04.23.StdCEQA Conditions PC ComLtr.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Members of the Planning Commission,
Attached please find comments written on behalf of The Hollow Revolution ("THoR"), an association of neighbors living near 1776 Green Street, San Francisco, California.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Attorney Richard Drury directly.

Thank You,
[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