

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feeney, Claire \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment for June 3 meeting, Agenda item #8: 2424 Polk  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:22:00 PM

---

### Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Ashley Hinton <ahinton@studiogang.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:57 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Public Comment for June 3 meeting, Agenda item #8: 2424 Polk

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

Hi,

I have a public comment for the proposed Cannabis club at 2424 Polk. I am a resident on the same block at 2636 Larkin. I'll be calling in from 626-590-4643.

--

As an architect, I'm familiar with the Planning Code and working with the spirit of the code.

The Planning Code is clear that cannabis uses are not permitted within 600 feet of an existing school. There is a longstanding and well-loved preschool whose play yard is 83 feet from the proposed outdoor smoking lounge. This is a very narrow reading of a recently adopted section of code, as it allows cannabis clubs next to existing preschools.

Why might schools have a required radius?

-As a society we don't want children or teens walking by the establishment, or hanging out outside. Why wouldn't this apply to young children?

Is it to keep the smell of the outdoor lounge away from children?

-83 feet is close enough to smell the marijuana while playing in their play yard. The cannabis club

will have outdoor smoking that backs up to the play yard.

Is the radius to keep marijuana out of the hands of school children?

-Toddlers pick up things on the sidewalk. Any dropped cigarette butts could easily end up in tiny hands.

If you approve this, you are creating a precedent of allowing cannabis next to children's uses. You are also pushing a well loved preschool out of the neighborhood, as parents will pull their children from its program. I would never send my daughter to a school smelling of marijuana. Allowing one business will negatively hurt another. This application is a *conditional* use authorization; it is not their right to go into our neighborhood.

Thanks,  
Ashley

Ashley Hinton, RA

Studio Gang  
2325 Third Street, Suite 329  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
O +1 415 800 0717  
D +1 415 528 4980  
[studiodgang.com](http://studiodgang.com)

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**To:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:21:27 PM

---

### Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Diane Josephs <[djosephs@jandblawyers.com](mailto:djosephs@jandblawyers.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:51 AM  
**To:** Feeney, Claire (CPC) <[claire.feeney@sfgov.org](mailto:claire.feeney@sfgov.org)>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <[joel.koppel@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.koppel@sfgov.org)>; katherin.moore@sfgov.org; Chan, Deland (CPC) <[deland.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:deland.chan@sfgov.org)>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <[sue.diamond@sfgov.org](mailto:sue.diamond@sfgov.org)>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <[frank.fung@sfgov.org](mailto:frank.fung@sfgov.org)>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <[theresa.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.imperial@sfgov.org)>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <[rachael.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachael.tanner@sfgov.org)>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>; kcourtney@rhcasf.com; Diane Josephs <[djosephs@jandblawyers.com](mailto:djosephs@jandblawyers.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA

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

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

From: **Diane Josephs** <[djosephs@jandblawyers.com](mailto:djosephs@jandblawyers.com)>  
Date: Thu, Jun 3, 2021 at 11:46 AM  
Subject: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA  
To: Feeney, Claire (CPC)

June 3, 2021

Dear Commissioners,

Many neighbors near and adjacent to 2424 Polk intend to speak and /or have written of their concerns. I have been authorized to request a Continuance of the proposed project at 2424 Polk Street because of unidentified and unaddressed issues and the unanticipated consequences of an approval. In essence, we are addressing an unknown situation, the project has proceeded with

unprecedented speed since first proposal and limited notice to the public (December 20, 2020).

On March 16, 2021, this planning department noted extraordinary challenges of this past year: emergency limited activities outside, limited access to the planning department and its documents, limited socialization activities and movement, lack of childcare, preoccupation with care for vulnerable and ill family members and other actions necessary to respond to the emergency. **The department, therefore, provided developers an automatic 18 months extension. The immediate neighbors (150- 450 feet) request 2-4 weeks extension of this hearing to seek common ground and meaningfully respond to a project which has moved through Planning with exceptional speed.**

The Pre-Application zoom meeting was December 22, 2020, of this, most of us were not aware. In this COVID period, most of us neighbors were not outside, walking the street watching signs. When we became aware of the proposed project in what many of us still call the Jade Snow Wong building, we realized we had questions. These are the issues we wanted to address with the Project Sponsor. Project sponsor declined the extension.

In the event that the Commission decides not to allow a Continuance, the neighbors also request that any approval have the following conditions:

- 1) "Deliveries" to customers not be allowed. The applicant has a much larger site on Mission where such deliveries can be accommodated.
- 2) Smoking and vaporizing lounge not be allowed, without prejudice to applicant's seeking further consideration after substantive information and neighborhood meetings have occurred.
- 3) Hours be restricted to 10 am to 9 pm, consistent with the location.

The rationale is simple:

- 1) Polk Street is a narrow corridor, primarily residential north of Union Street. The 19 Polk is a major bus line that intersects with the 45 Union at Polk and Union. The Polk Street residential corridor is not adequate for the traffic that "deliveries" will entail, given the bus route and red zone 25 feet adjacent to the site and the outdoor dining "Shared Spaces" 25 feet adjacent to the proposed project and Bicycle lanes. The traffic management plan for the proposed project has not been addressed fully. Deliveries should not be allowed at this site, particularly in light of other site.
- 2) The Information provided regarding the smoking lounge is inadequate at this time. The ventilation plans for the proposed project need to be reviewed by the Department of Public Health. However, in its review of the proposed project, the Commission needs to note that the Russian Hill Academy at 1346 Union is approximately 150' from the proposed project. The Academy is a pre-school, child care and after school center for up to 12 years of age. While the Academy is not considered a 'school' within the regulations for this industry, children are on site 5 days a week for 5 to 10 hours. The risk and potential impact a smoking and vaporizing lounge on pre-school and young children cannot be underestimated. A Smoking and Vaporizing lounge should not be allowed at this time. There is no information provided regarding how to address very complicated issue, particularly in light of Covid: unvaccinated customers engaging in, by definition, the opposite of social distancing: sharing bong, rigs, passing joints etc. Moreover, no information is provided as to controlling intoxicated "high" individuals. The applicants do not provide information as to relevant experience to running a lounge, nor an understanding of the sensitivity of the site location. Although Galileo High School is 1300' away, students congregate at Polk and Union catching the 19 Polk or 45 Union. Since the proposed Project will provide cannabis to those 18 years old with a card (attainable online in 24-48 hours. The City Controller's office has presented disturbing data and concerns regarding the 12% increase in use of cannabis at SF high schools since legalization. A consumption/smoking lounge will be an exciting, attractive nuisance, even if students only inhale smoke when the lounge doors open.
- 3) Polk Street north of Union is the buffer, transitional block to a primarily residential area; the block is unlike the more commercial area south of Union. The hours for this residential area should be restricted to hours more appropriate to a residential area. With this of course comes questions of how the proposed Project's management will manage lines, monitor consumption etc.



Please Note: The applicants' rationale for the project is lack of access-- purportedly one dispensary on Lombard. Actually, there is an ongoing dispensary at Hyde and California. The cannabis site at Washington and Polk has been approved – only 5 blocks from the proposed site—along with 5 others within an approximate .5 radius, already approved, some already under construction.

Sincerely,

electronic

Diane Josephs for Concerned Union Street Neighbors

cc) Joan Albertson, Cindy Chan, Dennis Blum, Dan Noia, Lynn Ferrante, Mike Albertson

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:50:42 AM

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** Diane Josephs <djosephs@jandblawyers.com>

**Date:** Thursday, June 3, 2021 at 11:46 AM

**To:** "Feeney, Claire (CPC)" <claire.feeney@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "katherin.moore@sfgov.org" <katherin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <deland.chan@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Tanner, Rachael (CPC)" <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, "kcourtney@rhcasf.com" <kcourtney@rhcasf.com>, Diane Josephs <djosephs@jandblawyers.com>

**Subject:** Fwd: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA

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

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

From: **Diane Josephs** <[djosephs@jandblawyers.com](mailto:djosephs@jandblawyers.com)>

Date: Thu, Jun 3, 2021 at 11:46 AM

Subject: June 3, 2021 Hearing re 2424 Polk St, line 8 2020-011603CUA

To: Feeney, Claire (CPC)

June 3, 2021

Dear Commissioners,

Many neighbors near and adjacent to 2424 Polk intend to speak and /or have written of their concerns. I have been authorized to request a Continuance of the proposed project at 2424 Polk Street because of unidentified and unaddressed issues and the unanticipated consequences of an approval. In essence, we are addressing an unknown situation, the project has proceeded with unprecedented speed since first proposal and limited notice to the public (December 20, 2020).

On March 16, 2021, this planning department noted extraordinary challenges of this past year: emergency limited activities outside, limited access to the planning department and its documents, limited socialization activities and movement, lack of childcare, preoccupation with care for vulnerable and ill family members and other actions necessary to respond to the emergency. **The department, therefore, provided developers an automatic 18 months extension. The immediate neighbors (150- 450 feet) request 2-4 weeks extension of this hearing to seek common ground and meaningfully respond to a project which has moved through Planning with exceptional speed.**

The Pre-Application zoom meeting was December 22, 2020, of this, most of us were not aware. In this COVID period, most of us neighbors were not outside, walking the street watching signs. When we became aware of the proposed project in what many of us still call the Jade Snow Wong building, we realized we had questions. These are the issues we wanted to address with the Project Sponsor. Project sponsor declined the extension.

In the event that the Commission decides not to allow a Continuance, the neighbors also request that any approval have the following conditions:

- 1) "Deliveries" to customers not be allowed. The applicant has a much larger site on Mission where such deliveries can be accommodated.
- 2) Smoking and vaporizing lounge not be allowed, without prejudice to applicant's seeking further consideration after substantive information and neighborhood meetings have occurred.
- 3) Hours be restricted to 10 am to 9 pm, consistent with the location.

The rationale is simple:

- 1) Polk Street is a narrow corridor, primarily residential north of Union Street. The 19 Polk is a major bus line that intersects with the 45 Union at Polk and Union. The Polk Street residential corridor is not adequate for the traffic that "deliveries" will entail, given the bus route and red zone 25 feet adjacent to the site and the outdoor dining "Shared Spaces" 25 feet adjacent to the proposed project and Bicycle lanes. The traffic management plan for the proposed project has not been addressed fully. Deliveries should not be allowed at this site, particularly in light of other site.
- 2) The Information provided regarding the smoking lounge is inadequate at this time. The ventilation plans for the proposed project need to be reviewed by the Department of Public Health. However, in its review of the proposed project, the Commission needs to note that the Russian Hill Academy at 1346 Union is approximately 150' from the proposed project. The Academy is a pre-school, child care and after school center for up to 12 years of age. While the Academy is not considered a 'school' within the regulations for this industry, children are on site 5 days a week for 5 to 10 hours. The risk and potential impact a smoking and vaporizing lounge on pre-school and young children cannot be underestimated. A Smoking and Vaporizing lounge should not be allowed at this time. There is no information provided regarding how to address very complicated issue, particularly in light of Covid: unvaccinated customers engaging in, by definition, the opposite of social distancing: sharing bong, rigs, passing joints etc. Moreover, no information is been provided as to controlling intoxicated "high" individuals. The applicants do not provide information as to relevant experience to running a lounge, nor an understanding of the sensitivity of the site location. Although Galileo High School is 1300' away, students congregate at Polk and Union catching the 19 Polk or 45 Union. Since the proposed Project will provide cannabis to those 18 years old with a card (attainable online in 24-48 hours. The City Controller's office has presented disturbing data and concerns regarding the 12% increase in use of cannabis at SF high schools since legalization. A consumption/smoking lounge will be an exciting, attractive nuisance, even if students only inhale smoke when the lounge doors open.
- 3) Polk Street north of Union is the buffer, transitional block to a primarily residential area; the block is unlike the more commercial area south of Union. The hours for this residential area should be restricted to hours more appropriate to a residential area. With this of course comes questions of how the proposed Project's management will manage lines, monitor consumption etc.

Please Note: The applicants' rationale for the project is lack of access-- purportedly one dispensary on Lombard. Actually, there is an ongoing dispensary at Hyde and California. The cannabis site at

Washington and Polk has been approved – only 5 blocks from the proposed site—along with 5 others within an approximate .5 radius, already approved, some already under construction.

Sincerely,

electronic

Diane Josephs for Concerned Union Street Neighbors

cc) Joan Albertson, Cindy Chan, Dennis Blum, Dan Noia, Lynn Ferrante, Mike Albertson

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2455 Harrison Street DR  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 8:56:54 AM

---

Commissioners,  
Please be advised that the DR for Harrison has been withdrawn.

The shadow remains on your agenda today.

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Winslow, David (CPC)" <david.winslow@sfgov.org>  
**Date:** Thursday, June 3, 2021 at 8:17 AM  
**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** "Westhoff, Alex (CPC)" <alex.westhoff@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** FW: 2455 Harrison Street DR

WITHDRAWN. see below.

David Winslow  
Principal Architect  
Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning  
San Francisco Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400 | San Francisco, California, 94103  
T: (628) 652-7335

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:** Albert Urrutia <aurrutia@atriumstructural.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 6:06 PM  
**To:** Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Toby Morris <toby@kermanmorris.com>  
**Subject:** 2455 Harrison Street DR

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



David,

I am officially withdrawing my DR against the property at 2455 Harrison Street

**Albert Urrutia**  
Atrium Structural Engineering  
Principal - Structural Engineer  
2451 Harrison Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
p-415-642-7722  
f-415-642-7590

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Concerns about 2455 Harrison St. building project  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 8:28:00 AM

---

**Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Michael Stoll <michael@michaelstoll.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:14 PM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>; Westhoff, Alex (CPC) <alex.westhoff@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Concerns about 2455 Harrison St. building project

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

Please address this message to the Planning Commission as a submission for public comment for the June 3, 2021, meeting. This is regard to discretionary review for the 2455 Harrison St. project proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_

To the Planning Commission,

My name is Michael Stoll, and I am president of the 832 Alabama Street Homeowners Association, which is adjacent to a property under consideration for review on June 3 — 2455 Harrison St.

I have concerns about the project as proposed in regard to total height and bulk of the structure. I believe the proposal as design is not allowed by the planning code.

1. This building appears to be in the 48-X height district on the current planning map, so the maximum height is 48 feet. Fine. It was confusing to see in a small-print note on page G2.01

of the plan submitted, in the Height and Area Limitations section (in box 3.1): "85' is max. for most stringent use within type of construction (R-2 occupancy in Type V-A Construction)." Why is the builder claiming such a high total limit? Also, why is the claimed construction type is V-A, when the proposal is actually III-A (box 1.1). This seems like an error in the application.

2. Notwithstanding, if the height of the building as portrayed in the elevation were actually 48 feet, there would be no issue. However, there is what amounts to an additional floor on the building that takes it to a total of 64 feet, if you include the 16 foot elevator shaft and surrounding structure. My concern is in the bulk of that additional structure. Planning code 260 (b) (1) (B) says the following: "For elevator penthouses, the exemption shall be limited to the top 16 feet and limited to the footprint of the elevator shaft, regardless of the height limit of the building." In the elevations provided, there is a large additional structure above the 48' height limit of the roof, which includes two staircases and a common space. This to me seems to violate the planning code's requirement that it be limited to the "footprint" of the shaft.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael Stoll  
832 B Alabama St.  
San Francisco, CA 94110

CC: David Winslow and Alex Westhoff, Planning Department staff



**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission hearing, Thursday, June 3,2021, Conditional Use 2424 Polk Street, Record No. : 2020-011603CUA  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 8:20:28 AM

---

### Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Penelope Clark <penelopeclark@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 4:17 PM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Claire.Feeney@sfgove.org  
**Subject:** Planning Commission hearing, Thursday, June 3,2021, Conditional Use 2424 Polk Street, Record No. : 2020-011603CUA

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

Dear Commissioners:

I am very concerned about granting a Conditional Use Authorization for Cannabis Retail Use for 2424 Polk Street.

1. Because 2424 Polk Street is a 25 foot wide lot, and is between lots which have both residential and commercial buildings, It cannot meet the Health Department's Rules and Regulations for Cannabis Consumption that the exhaust for the "vaping lounge" NOT be less than 15 Feet .

Even with strict rules on exhaust systems, I have be told by a friend who lives near a dispensary in the City that the smell of pot smoke permeates his neighborhood. Also, customers of the dispensary loiter in the area blocking driveways and smoking, and the dispensary personnel are unable to control this behavior.

2. Other than the Health Department's regulations controlling ventilation, there are no regulations preventing the "vaping lounge" from presenting amplified entertainment such as televised sports programming, such as a sports bar, from early morning until late (10:00PM) at night.

Since I have two rental residences on my property next door (2428 and 2432 Polk Street), I am very concerned about the negative effect on their livability and being able to retain tenants.

Therefore, because 2424 Polk Street is surrounded by residential buildings (including purely residential on Union Street), I feel that the proposed use is inappropriate and that Conditional Use should not be approved.

Thank you,  
Penelope Clark  
Owner, 2428-2432 Polk Street  
(415) 776-3876

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2424 Polk Street for Cannabis Club - 83 feet from Preschool  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:49:34 AM

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Feeney, Claire (CPC)" <claire.feeney@sfgov.org>  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at 11:37 AM  
**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** "Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)" <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>, "Christensen, Michael (CPC)" <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <deland.chan@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Tanner, Rachael (CPC)" <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** RE: 2424 Polk Street for Cannabis Club - 83 feet from Preschool

Hi Ashley and Commissioners,

Thank you for your message about 2424 Polk Street. As I mentioned in an email earlier today around 9:30 am, your opposition has been logged in the Project file and forwarded to the Project Sponsor. The 600-foot school buffer rule applies to grades Kindergarten through Twelve. As daycares, nursery schools, and preschools are not subject to the 600-foot rule, the Project Site is eligible for a Cannabis CUA.

Best,  
Claire

**Claire Feeney, AICP, Planner II**  
**Southeast Team, Current Planning Division**

San Francisco Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7313 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The [public is encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 11:33 AM  
**To:** Feeney, Claire (CPC) <claire.feeney@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>; Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** FW: 2424 Polk Street for Cannabis Club - 83 feet from Preschool

**Jonas P Ionin**

**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <[kathrin.moore@sfgov.org](mailto:kathrin.moore@sfgov.org)>

**Date:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at 11:22 AM

**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Fwd: 2424 Polk Street for Cannabis Club - 83 feet from Preschool

I do not see your name on it, also Staff should be copied. Thank you,

Kathrin Moore

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Ashley Hinton <[ahinton@studiogang.com](mailto:ahinton@studiogang.com)>

**Date:** June 2, 2021 at 10:10:00 AM PDT

**To:** "Koppel, Joel (CPC)" <[joel.koppel@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.koppel@sfgov.org)>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <[kathrin.moore@sfgov.org](mailto:kathrin.moore@sfgov.org)>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <[deland.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:deland.chan@sfgov.org)>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <[sue.diamond@sfgov.org](mailto:sue.diamond@sfgov.org)>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <[frank.fung@sfgov.org](mailto:frank.fung@sfgov.org)>, "Imperial, Theresa (CPC)" <[theresa.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.imperial@sfgov.org)>, "Tanner, Rachael (CPC)" <[rachael.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachael.tanner@sfgov.org)>

**Subject: 2424 Polk Street for Cannabis Club - 83 feet from Preschool**

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

Planning Commissioners,

On tomorrow's agenda you'll be reviewing a proposed Cannabis Club in Russian Hill. I'm an architect in San Francisco, and I live in the same block as the proposed Cannabis Retail Use.

There is a preschool at 1346 Union Street that backs up to the property for the Cannabis lounge. The proposed outdoor smoking lounge would be 83 feet from the children's existing play area. I'm stunned that the Planning Commission would consider a CUA for a Cannabis lounge so close to

children. The planning code requires 600 feet from schools, but preschools aren't included in this rule. Excluding preschools isn't in spirit of the code. The preschool is a licensed and longstanding establishment.

Not only would the cannabis smoke be toxic for the developing children (the school serves children 16 months to 12 years,) but it is likely parents would pull their students from the program creating a hardship on the existing business. I would not enroll my children where the play yard smelled of cannabis. The Cannabis club would push the preschool out of the neighborhood. There is already a shortage of early childhood learning in the neighborhood. The preschool is dual language English-Mandarin, and also serves the Chinese population. Granting a conditional use permit to a cannabis club by pushing out a preschool is not in the spirit of the planning code.

Here is information on the preschool. It has been in the neighborhood for more than 10 years, and I'm surprised the Planning Department overlooked it. <https://www.russianhillacademy.net/>

I've attached a markup of the Assessor's Map for block 0525 showing the two parcels.

Thanks,  
Ashley

Ashley Hinton, AIA

Studio Gang  
2325 Third Street, Suite 329  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
O +1 415 800 0717  
D +1 415 528 4980  
[studiogang.com](http://studiogang.com)

Thanks,  
Ashley

Ashley Hinton, RA

Studio Gang  
2325 Third Street, Suite 329  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
O +1 415 800 0717  
D +1 415 528 4980  
[studiogang.com](http://studiogang.com)

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I am writing in Support of the application of the Russian Hill Cannabis Club, SFPC #2020-011603CUA  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 8:03:48 AM

---

### Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Bram Goodwin <goodwin.bram@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 7:49 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Feeney, Claire (CPC) <claire.feeney@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** I am writing in Support of the application of the Russian Hill Cannabis Club, SFPC #2020-011603CUA

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

My name is Bram Goodwin, Founder of the San Francisco Social Club. As cannabis consumer advocates, we encourage expansion of the San Francisco Retail Cannabis options, especially cannabis consumption.

We support the Russian Hill Cannabis Club Dispensary Project, 2424 Polk St, item #8 on the June 3 agenda. Al Shawa, owner of Mission Street Cannabis Club, is one of the original Cannabis Club Owners. He helped bring legal cannabis to San Francisco. We have worked with him on various cannabis issues, found him to be very community oriented, and he is an important part of the SF Cannabis Community.

Importantly, there are no Cannabis Retail Locations in this part of the Polk Street Retail environment. By approving this application, residents of this neighborhood would now be able to pick up Cannabis at the same time as shopping for other essential products.

We want to be able to shop near our homes, not drive miles to other parts of the City to do our

Cannabis Shopping.

Also, we implore you to approve this application, as it would include one of the few Cannabis Consumption locations in San Francisco. The Covid-19 Pandemic has shown the absolute need for expansion of Consumer Consumption locations.

We encourage you to approve the 2424 Polk St Cannabis Retail Project, including consumption.

Thank you.

bram

Bram Goodwin  
photographer  
Founder, San Francisco Social Club  
415.505.3686  
twitter: @bramgoodwin  
linkedin: bramfoto

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**To:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Property at 249 Texas Street  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 8:02:06 AM  
**Attachments:** [249TexasOpposition-ErnestoValencia .pdf](#)

---

### Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Valencia, Ernesto <Ernesto.Valencia@ucsf.edu>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:27 PM

**To:** Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; rich.sucre@sfgov.org; Westhoff, Alex (CPC) <alex.westhoff@sfgov.org>; mooreurban@aol.co

**Subject:** Property at 249 Texas Street

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

Hello Commissioners,

I would like to submit the following brief concerning the property at 249 Texas Street which will be discussed at the upcoming meeting this Thursday on June 4th. I am the prior owner of the property.

Commissioner Moore, there is a couple of answers to questions that you posed at the last hearing that I answered directly in here.

Thank you,

Ernesto Valencia

Administrative Officer II



Microbiology and Immunology

513 Parnassus, HSW 1542, Box 0552

San Francisco, CA 94143

Tel: 415-506-9913

Fax: 415-476-6185

[Ernesto.Valencia@ucsf.edu](mailto:Ernesto.Valencia@ucsf.edu)

**From:** [Feeney, Claire \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Patrick Rutter](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 2424 Polk Street  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 4:10:06 PM

---

Hi Pat,

Thank you for your email. You are correct that the backyard is NOT accessible to the business or customers. There is an existing door that will be retained and it will NEVER be open when the smoking lounge is active. The [Department of Public Health has stringent regulations](#) for air quality and ventilation systems around smoking lounges, including that you cannot have open windows or doors.

The rear windows and door will provide sunlight and viewing, as you noted. I've logged your email as support for the Project and have forwarded it to the Applicant. Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Best,  
Claire

**Claire Feeney, AICP, Planner II**  
**Southeast Team, Current Planning Division**

San Francisco Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7313 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The [public is encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:49 PM  
**Cc:** Feeney, Claire (CPC) <claire.feeney@sfgov.org>; Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** FW: 2424 Polk Street

**Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Patrick Rutter <[pat.rutter@gmail.com](mailto:pat.rutter@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 11:30 AM

**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** 2424 Polk Street

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

Hi there - hope you are doing well.

On 2424 polk, its not a big question and am generally supportive as the conditional use authorization draft notion is quite extensive (and it appears this has been going on for a while with good work done here, and I'm new), but for public comments just wanted to confirm that, as per the plans, the backyard area is non-accessible to customers/personnel since their plans have a door that is going to be installed there - so will it just be opened or something then with no access to garden area?

That then leads to the question - if the door is open, would that mess with the noise / odor control as noted was fine on Point 7.B.3 on page 6 of the draft notion. Or is this a moot point as just for viewing anyway?

Presume this has been covered, so just catching up. Thanks and good luck.

Pat

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Foster, Nicholas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 469 Stevenson Project - Hearing June 10th  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:39:40 PM  
**Attachments:** [Lou Vasquez letter June 1 2019.pdf](#)

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** John Elberling <johne@todco.org>  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 at 12:40 PM  
**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: 469 Stevenson Project - Hearing June 10th

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

oops. forgot to pdf it. here.

---

**From:** John Elberling  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:35 PM  
**To:** Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** 469 Stevenson Project - Hearing June 10th

Please forward copies of this letter to the Planning Commissioners.

Thanks!

je

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [May, Christopher \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: American Buddhist Society Center, 1750 Van Ness Avenue  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:37:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [vncnc Buddhistspdf2.pdf](#)

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** Marlayne Morgan <marlayne16@gmail.com>

**Date:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 at 12:10 PM

**To:** "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <deland.chan@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Rachel.Tanner@sfgov.org" <Rachel.Tanner@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** American Buddhist Society Center, 1750 Van Ness Avenue

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

Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

Attached is the **Van Ness Corridor Neighborhoods Council VNCNC** letter of support for the proposed ABSC project at 1750 Van Ness Avenue.

Best regards,

Marlayne Morgan and Jim Warshell  
Co-Chairs

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: \*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\* MAYOR LONDON BREED UNVEILS BALANCED BUDGET TO SUPPORT RECOVERY AND MEET CITY'S TOP CHALLENGES  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:30:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [06.01.21 Budget Announcement.pdf](#)

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <[mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 1, 2021 at 12:43 PM  
**To:** "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <[mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** \*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\* MAYOR LONDON BREED UNVEILS BALANCED BUDGET TO SUPPORT RECOVERY AND MEET CITY'S TOP CHALLENGES

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**

Tuesday, June 1, 2021  
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, [mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)

**\*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\***  
**MAYOR LONDON BREED UNVEILS BALANCED BUDGET TO SUPPORT RECOVERY AND MEET CITY'S TOP CHALLENGES**

*Two-year budget proposal sets City priorities in supporting a sustained and equitable economic recovery and addressing critical issues that include homelessness, public safety, behavioral health, and youth and family support*

**San Francisco, CA** — Mayor London N. Breed today unveiled her budget proposal for Fiscal Years (FY) 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. The budget proposal includes important new investments to support San Francisco's economic recovery, continue the COVID-19 response, ensure public safety, provide behavioral health care, prevent homelessness and transition people into services and housing, create more housing, promote nonprofit sustainability and equity initiatives, and support children, youth and their families.

The annual \$13.1 billion for FY 2021-22 and \$12.8 billion for FY 2022-23 budget seeks to be responsive to the City's most urgent needs as it moves forward on the road to recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, while preserving long-term financial sustainability. Mayor Breed announced her budget at the Willie 'Woo Woo' Wong Playground—a center for community engagement and recreation in the heart of Chinatown. The renovated playground and clubhouse opened in February, and is an example of the types of capital projects that Mayor Breed is proposing to support in the budget.

The proposed budget follows months of collaborative work with elected officials, City departments, non-profit organizations, neighborhood groups, merchants, residents, and other stakeholders. Mayor Breed and her staff conducted a comprehensive public outreach process, consisting of a public meeting to obtain input on budget priorities, two town halls, and online feedback to hear from residents on their priorities and reflect them in the budget.

“San Francisco demonstrated our values and resilience over the last year, and I have no doubt that we will come back even stronger from COVID-19,” said Mayor London Breed. “As we move forward out of the pandemic this budget will ensure that our recovery is equitable and that we are delivering solutions to the most important issues impacting our city. We’re making significant investments to reduce homelessness, expand mental health support, support public safety, and address the social inequities laid bare by this pandemic, while also making responsible choices that maintain our budget reserves so we can continue providing critical City services and support for our most vulnerable residents, no matter what lies ahead.”

### **Driving a Sustained and Equitable Economic Recovery and Continuing City’s COVID-19 Response**

The Mayor’s proposed budget invests approximately \$477 million over the two years for various initiatives to drive and accelerate the City’s economic recovery, while also supporting the City’s COVID-19 response. Major recovery initiatives include Community Ambassadors and events and activities to enliven San Francisco’s downtown, backfilling the loss of hotel tax revenue for the arts, addressing student learning loss, the Women and Families First Initiative, incentivizing the return of conventions at the Moscone Center, a new Trans Basic Income pilot program, and continuing the JobsNow workforce program and Working Families Credit.

Of this total, about \$384 million will be spent to continue the City’s COVID-19 shelter response, food security programs, vaccination efforts, testing operations, and the COVID-19 Command Center. Funding will also support community-based COVID-19 recovery programming, specifically targeting resources to populations disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. This funding includes small business support, economic relief, workforce development funds, and various arts, cultural, and recreational programming.

### **Making Historic Investments in Homelessness and Housing**

Mayor Breed’s proposed budget includes significant investments to address homelessness in San Francisco and expand the work started through the Homelessness Recovery Plan to create 6,000 placements for people experiencing homelessness. In total, the budget leverages over \$1 billion over the next two years in local, state, and federal resources to add up to 4,000 new housing placements, prevent homelessness and eviction for over 7,000 households, support additional safe parking sites, and fund the continuation of a new 40-bed emergency shelter for families. All of these investments are in addition to prior commitments. This funding will enable the City to cap all Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) rents in the City’s PSH portfolio at 30% of a tenant’s income.

### **Expanding Mental Health and Substance Use Support**

Continuing her commitment to helping people with behavioral health and substance use issues, Mayor Breed’s budget contains approximately \$300 million in new investments for behavioral health services. Included in the budget is funding to prevent overdoses through medication assisted treatment, a drug sobering site, and expanded naloxone distribution. The budget also includes funding to support new and existing Street Response Teams, including

the Street Crisis Response Team, Street Wellness Response Team, and Street Overdose Response Team. This investment will fund the City's plan to add over 640 new treatment beds, provide case management and care coordination for people receiving services, and expand services at the City's Behavioral Health Access Center. This investment will also provide targeted services for transgender and Transitional Age Youth clients, and increase services for clients in shelters and Permanent Supportive Housing.

### **Investing in Public Safety, Victims' Services, and Justice Innovations**

The Mayor's budget includes over \$65 million over the two years to prevent violence, support victims, continue the City's investments in alternative responses to non-criminal activity, and create an Office of Justice Innovation to oversee, implement and work with community to expand this critical work. The budget includes expanded violence prevention programming and funding for victims' rights, including targeted investments to support community-based violence prevention and intervention work, and to San Francisco's Asian and Pacific Islander community. The proposed budget includes funding to maintain police staffing levels, including funding for new academy classes and staffing to support compliance with SB 1421 as part of City's efforts to increase accountability, which includes implementing the 272 Department of Justice recommendations.

To strengthen the City's non-law enforcement response to non-criminal activity, the proposed budget includes new funding for Street Response Teams and to support call diversion. Additionally, the budget includes funding to replace Sheriff's deputies at public health sites with trained health care professionals and community members.

### **Supporting Children, Youth, and Their Families**

Mayor Breed is proposing \$144 million over the two years to lay the groundwork for early learning and universal preschool in San Francisco. This includes funding for childcare subsidies, workforce compensation for childcare providers, child health and wellbeing, and Family Resource Centers. The budget also maintains the City's existing investments in children and youth, invests significant new funding to address learning loss, funds mental health for SFUSD students, and supports the Mayor's Opportunities for All initiative.

### **Supporting Long-Term Economic Justice Strategies**

The Mayor's budget continues the City's \$60 million annual investment in the Dream Keeper Initiative, which Mayor Breed launched to reinvest in services and programs that support San Francisco's Black and African American community. The proposed budget also includes funding to waive additional fees and fines paid to the City by San Francisco residents. Additionally, the budget supports the City's efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion and ensure citywide coordination of equity work. The Mayor's proposed budget also makes a significant investment in the sustainability of the City's nonprofit partners with \$76.4 million for an ongoing cost of doing business increase.

### **Investing in Capital Projects and Affordable Housing**

The Mayor is proposing significant investments in capital and one-time projects, which will create jobs and spur economic recovery. The proposed budget provides \$50.6 million to support affordable housing developments in San Francisco. The proposed budget also includes \$208 million for projects from the City's Capital Plan, including street and parks infrastructure improvements, an expansion of fiber to affordable housing, and community facility improvements. The proposed budget also includes funding to replace aging equipment in the Fire and Police departments, as well as funding to purchase a site for an LGBT Cultural



Museum.

**Ensuring Financial Resilience**

Mayor Breed’s proposed budget makes the above significant investments in a way that is financially responsible. By utilizing funding from the American Rescue Plan and other one-time sources, the City is able to maintain its reserves. This allows the City to preserve its Rainy Day Reserve for future uncertainty and risk. To hedge against future risk and uncertainty, the Mayor’s proposed budget re-allocates unappropriated funds to create two new reserves that will help to manage unforeseen costs due to potential FEMA reimbursement disallowances and to manage future budget shortfalls.

Mayor Breed’s complete budget proposal for FY 2021-22 and 2022-23 can be found [here](#).

Through the end of June, the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold public hearings on the budget, and will make recommendations to the full Board. In July, the budget is heard and voted on by the full Board of Supervisors, and returns to the Mayor for her approval, typically by August 1st.

###

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feeney, Claire \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2424 Polk Street  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:48:51 PM

---

**Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Patrick Rutter <pat.rutter@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 11:30 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** 2424 Polk Street

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

Hi there - hope you are doing well.

On 2424 polk, its not a big question and am generally supportive as the conditional use authorization draft notion is quite extensive (and it appears this has been going on for a while with good work done here, and I'm new), but for public comments just wanted to confirm that, as per the plans, the backyard area is non-accessible to customers/personnel since their plans have a door that is going to be installed there - so will it just be opened or something then with no access to garden area?

That then leads to the question - if the door is open, would that mess with the noise / odor control as noted was fine on Point 7.B.3 on page 6 of the draft notion. Or is this a moot point as just for viewing anyway?

Presume this has been covered, so just catching up. Thanks and good luck.

Pat

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Dito, Matthew \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 562 28th Ave. Notice of Appeal  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:52:55 AM

---

**Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7600 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Hart Mail <householdorders@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 28, 2021 4:49 PM  
**Subject:** 562 28th Ave. Notice of Appeal

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

Firm Name	Agent Name	Role	From	To
<a href="#">Info</a>	JAKON INVESTMENT GROUP LP	ROMAN KNOP	PAYOR	11/12/2020
<a href="#">Info</a>	ROMKON INC	ROMAN KNOP	CONTRACTOR	12/22/2020
<a href="#">Info</a>	SIA CONSULTING CORP.	SALLY SZETO	AUTHORIZED AGENT-OTHERS	12/17/2020
<a href="#">Info</a>	SIA CONSULTING X103	BAHMAN GHASSEMZADEH	AUTHORIZED AGENT-OTHERS	12/17/2020
1				

Permit Number: 201705055838

To: San Francisco Planning

From: Residents of 28th Avenue & Anza Street San Francisco CA 94121

Subject: Permit Number: 201705055838

Proposal Record: 2015-015199CUA; Block/Lot: 1517 / 022  
Francisco CA 94121

We are residents of 28th Avenue and Anza Street., San Francisco CA 94121, and are collectively writing to you with **reference** to the property above. The recent notice on the building was not posted in a timely manner (15 days is not enough time to organize materials anyway and less than 2 weeks is even more unrealistic!). A minimum of 30 days should be granted as well as a waiver of the \$175 appeals fee since this is a financial hardship few can manage during a pandemic. None of the residents on the block received written notification by mail of the issuance of permits. It appears proper protocol is not being followed regarding this property, which appears to be a perfectly sound home unworthy of demolition. There are so few single family homes left on this street and with green space for endangered species of butterflies and birds of special concern that is vital in a city it is imperative to preserve it as it stands. We strongly believe that no one would approve/sign off on a project of this magnitude on the block they reside within. Imagine, if you will, living with this project if it goes forward right next door or across the street for over 2,000 days. The devastating noise and air pollution in an already challenging time would only make matters worse. Furthermore, the retrofitting projects many buildings were forced to undergo may be compromised by a demolition and the excavation. Who will be responsible should damage ensue? Many of us fear a domino effect as conjoined buildings uphill from this site may weaken with each vibration.

**1. Environmental and Health impact:** We live in a biodiversity hotspot; therefore, building over any precious greenspace is irresponsible. The Mission Blue Butterflies, Rufous and Allen's Hummingbirds, raptors such as falcons and hawks, the SF Garter Snake, etc. would suffer from such an ill-conceived project. A demolition in and of itself would create immense pollution not just affecting wildlife but fellow residents, many of whom are long time elderly individuals who may suffer serious damage to their health and pursue legal action as a result. Some neighbors are growing organic food that will become tainted/inedible and with more units comes more fire danger, traffic, noise, pests, disease and other health issues especially of concern during a time of pandemic--in addition to more people with dogs which they don't clean up after adding to the already unsanitary sidewalks and streets that "street cleaning" does not effectively nor sufficiently address.

**2. Parking provisions:** It is well known that parking is a serious challenge in the Richmond

District-28th Avenue and adjacent blocks have extremely limited parking, and existing residents are facing major challenges with parking their cars in the neighborhood, especially given **several** of the parking spots on 28th Avenue have parking meters. The planned

**project** does not **include** adequate parking provisions for **the 8** proposed units. Many households are 2 or more car households. It can easily be assumed that at a minimum, the proposed multi-unit mixed use project will require 8 parking spots for the 8 units plus additional spaces for visitors, service providers/deliveries. Over the years the owner/contractor has often appeared in a hummer which takes of two spaces itself. The addition of so many vehicles to the already limited **street** parking is not feasible, and will be very troublesome to the residents of 28th Avenue and neighboring blocks.

Inadequate parking is **guaranteed** to result in illegal double-parking. This poses a serious threat to residents' safety by increasing the risk of accidents, particularly for residents of adjacent buildings, as our ability to see oncoming traffic while exiting our **garages** will be severely compromised by the resulting blind spots. There have already **been several** incidents of near-misses due to vehicles double parking illegally on 28th Avenue. Lastly, the recently constructed building on our block (518, 520 and 522 28th Avenue) also includes parking for the 3 units in the building. It is imperative that the proposed plans are revised to accommodate additional parking spots, to avoid further increasing the density of cars

that will need **to be** parked on the **street**.

**3. Boundary of planned property:** **The** planned property extends beyond **the** boundary of **adjacent**

buildings, 558 28th Avenue, and 568 28th Avenue. It is reasonable to expect that the boundary of

the planned property is at least in line with the envelope of the adjacent buildings.

**4. Impact to existing views:** **There are several** residents in addresses 568-592 28th Avenue whose views of the

Golden Gate Bridge will be compromised per the proposed construction plans, thereby

significantly impacting the overall value of their property.

**5. Proposed lightwell:** **There are several** residents of 558 28th Ave who have their bedroom

windows that open into the lightwell and rely entirely on the lightwell to provide natural

light to their bedrooms. The same is the case for the stairwell. The proposed project severely impacts the natural light in this building as the plans incorporate a small light well. Reduced natural light will negatively impact residents' health and living environment, and the overall sustainability of

units in this building.

**6. Construction timing & litigation:** Given that many residents on this street are senior citizens, and families with small children, we would like to request that construction is limited to 8 am - 6 pm on weekdays only. We will be highly appreciative if this request is fulfilled as it will allow us peace and quiet over the **weekends to get some rest**. Below is just one case this contractor has been involved in and we fear similar issues arising:

<https://unicourt.com/case/ca-sfc-department-of-industrial-relations-vs-romkon-inc-551750>

We respectfully request that the Planning Commission (re)evaluate our concerns and please disallow the proposed project as currently planned as it negatively impacts the daily lives of existing residents. Please note that several residents of our block are in agreement, as indicated by their signatures in the below table. Thank you for your consideration.

Name

Address

Signature and  
Date

ANSHUL  
SHAH

558 28TH AVE 202,  
SAN FRANCISCO,  
CA 94121

4/24/19

KARISHMA AMIN 558 28th Ave, Apt202 Kanshmefnin

San Francisco CA 94121

4/24/2019

SAM FLYASH 558 28 ave 101 S.F CA94121 4-24-19

Mariana Flyash 558 28th ave #101 SF CA 94121

04.24:19

Roger Leung 558 28th Ave \*02 SF CA  
9412 4-24-19

Josephine Leung 558-28th Ave  
102 SF.CA 94121 4.24-19

TYLER  
JONES/568  
28th Ave. #2  
SF CA 94121

Alyxandria Jones | 568 28th Ave #2 SF CA 94121

4.25  
.19

Name

Addresses

**Signature and Date**

Girila M. Dellegatta 588 28th Ave St, CA 94121

Daniel Lensgerich 592 28th Ave

San Francisco, CA, 94121

4-28-19

Jeff Haptonstall

592 28th Ave SF CA 94121

David Holt

561 28th Ave. SF ca 94121

4/29/19

Sandra Holt

561-28th Ave



<sup>ME</sup>  
CAROLINE HART

568 28 Th  
AVE SF.CA  
94121

Chika

ko Hart

568 28th

Ave

SFCA

94121

4/29/

19

Levinton TATIANA 3620 Anza St

SF CA

94121

Ernie MCNABB 558 -28 Ave SF, CA 94121

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#); [CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS](#); [STACY, KATE \(CAT\)](#); [YANG, AUSTIN \(CAT\)](#); [JENSEN, KRISTEN \(CAT\)](#)  
**Subject:** CPC Calendars for June 3, 2021  
**Date:** Friday, May 28, 2021 4:25:36 PM  
**Attachments:** [20210603\\_cal.docx](#)  
[20210603\\_cal.pdf](#)  
[CPC Hearing Results 2021.docx](#)  
[Advance Calendar - 202100603.xlsx](#)

---

Commissioners,  
Attached are your Calendars for June 3, 2021.

Enjoy the Memorial Day weekend,

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Sider, Dan \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: DR Info Related to CPC Rules & Regs  
**Date:** Friday, May 28, 2021 1:24:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [DRsFiled2015 to 2020.pdf](#)

---

Corrected time period. See below:

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** Dan Sider <[dan.sider@sfgov.org](mailto:dan.sider@sfgov.org)>  
**Date:** Friday, May 28, 2021 at 1:23 PM  
**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <[rich.hillis@sfgov.org](mailto:rich.hillis@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: DR Info Related to CPC Rules & Regs

Hi Jonas

A quick correction of the record: It's been brought to my attention that the table in my email below referenced the wrong time period. Rather than DR's from 2010 onward, the data actually reflects DRs from the start of 2015 through the end of 2020. I've also attached an updated map consistent with this time period. It shows an extremely similar distribution as the previous map.

dan

**Daniel A. Sider, AICP**  
**Director of Executive Programs**  
San Francisco Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628-652-7539 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

---

**From:** Dan Sider <[dan.sider@sfgov.org](mailto:dan.sider@sfgov.org)>  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 26, 2021 at 11:06 AM  
**To:** Jonas Ionin <[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** DR Info Related to CPC Rules & Regs

Hi Jonas

Providing you with the following so that you can share with the Commissioners in advance of Thursday's hearing.

Specifically, Commissioner Diamond requested a map of DRs, so I've attached that as a PDF.

Additionally, the following table might be helpful, showing that more than half of the 694 DRs filed since 2010 are located within Districts 2 or 8.

<b>Supervisor</b>	
<b>District</b>	<b>Percent of DRs</b>
One	4.2%
Two	24.4%
Three	6.2%
Four	3.2%
Five	4.8%
Six	2.3%
Seven	5.5%
Eight	27.2%
Nine	11.7%
Ten	8.4%
Eleven	2.3%
Grand Total	100.0%

Thanks.

dan

**Daniel A. Sider, AICP**

**Director of Executive Programs**

San Francisco Planning Department

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628-652-7539 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).



**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: brief in opposition to 2020-003223CUA (249 Texas St)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:19:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [Opposition to CUA 249 Texas Street draft May26.pdf](#)

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Sasha M. Gala" <sashagala@yahoo.com>  
**Date:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 at 5:14 PM  
**To:** "Tanner, Rachael (CPC)" <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <deland.chan@sfgov.org>, Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "Westhoff, Alex (CPC)" <alex.westhoff@sfgov.org>, Richard Sucre <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>, Kathleen Block <krobertsblock@aol.com>, Matthew Boden <matthew.t.boden@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** brief in opposition to 2020-003223CUA (249 Texas St)

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

Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached our brief in opposition to 2020-003223CUA at 249 Texas Street.

Thank you,

Sasha Gala  
Matthew Boden  
Kathy Block  
et al

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: \*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\* MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO SUPPORT THE RETURN OF CONVENTIONS TO SAN FRANCISCO  
**Date:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 4:15:58 PM  
**Attachments:** [05.27.21 Moscone Convention Center Rental Rate Funding.pdf](#)

---

**Jonas P Ionin**  
**Director of Commission Affairs**  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628.652.7589 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

---

**From:** "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <[mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)>  
**Date:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 at 4:09 PM  
**To:** "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <[mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** \*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\* MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO SUPPORT THE RETURN OF CONVENTIONS TO SAN FRANCISCO

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**  
Thursday, May 27, 2021  
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, [mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org)

**\*\*\* PRESS RELEASE \*\*\***

**MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES PLAN TO SUPPORT  
THE RETURN OF CONVENTIONS TO SAN FRANCISCO**

*Mayor Breed proposes \$4.6 million over two years to reduce the cost of rental rates for conventions in the Moscone Center*

**San Francisco, CA** — Mayor London N. Breed and City Administrator Carmen Chu today announced a plan to invest \$4.6 million to support the return of conventions to San Francisco. These funds will be used to reduce the cost of renting space at Moscone Center, San Francisco's convention center, and are intended to attract conventions, conferences, trade shows, and other large events back to San Francisco. This funding is part of Mayor Breed's efforts to support San Francisco's downtown and economic recovery, including community ambassadors and activations in the area.

Conventions and the business travelers that they bring to the city are a key part of San Francisco's \$10 billion tourism industry. During the COVID-19 pandemic, non-essential travel and large gatherings were suspended. With the reopening of businesses and activities, this investment demonstrates San Francisco's commitment to welcoming and supporting the return of conventions to the city. The City's commitment to regaining its convention industry comes as Salesforce today announced that Dreamforce, its annual convention and the world's largest software event, is returning to San Francisco in September 2021.

“Conventions and conferences help support our downtown's economy and tourism industry,

and we're so excited to welcome these events and their attendees back to our city," said Mayor Breed. "Tourism and convention dollars help pay for important City services and allow us to take care of our most vulnerable residents. We're making it even easier for organizers to host their next event in San Francisco, because bringing these activities will bring life and energy back to our downtown area and help our entire city recover."

Mayor Breed plans to reduce the cost of rental rates for conventions at the Moscone Center with funding in her proposed City Budget, which will be introduced on June 1, 2021. The Mayor is proposing to dedicate \$2.6 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22 and \$2 million in FY 2022-23. If approved in the budget, these funds will be available in late summer.

This support for conventions at the Moscone Center comes at a pivotal time, when the convention market is in flux as a result of COVID-19. As San Francisco focuses on confirming conventions that were postponed due to COVID-19 and reestablishing itself as a destination for conventions, it must compete with other cities that are working to attract convention business. This funding provides San Francisco with another tool to ensure this aspect of the city's economy is supported and will help to confirm several pending conventions that are considering San Francisco and attract other conventions to the city.

"San Francisco is a dynamic and remarkable City to visit and a strong convention lineup helps anchor our tourism industry, supporting local businesses, hospitality and the entertainment industry," said City Administrator Carmen Chu, who also served as co-chair for the City's Economic Recovery Task Force. "Our center is ready to welcome visitors back with enhanced operating protocols and this funding only strengthens our position in the competitive national market for convention business."

San Francisco remains a competitive destination for conventions. San Francisco has been a national leader its response to COVID-19 and has one of the highest vaccination rates in the world, demonstrating the City's commitment to doing everything possible to protect the safety of its residents and anyone who want to visit. The City's location as the "Gateway to the West," its world class airport with global connectivity, and robust hospitality infrastructure, combined with its world-renowned restaurants and cultural institutions, and access to nature and global regional destinations such as Napa Valley and Big Sur, make it highly desirable as a location.

"Group convention business at Moscone Center fuels our economy, provides much needed tax revenues to the city and good jobs," said Joe D'Alessandro, President and CEO of the San Francisco Travel Association. "The convention market is highly competitive, and this Moscone Convention funding is essential in helping us attract group business and remain relevant in the aggressive convention market."

San Francisco hosted more than 1,600 conventions and meetings in 2019, but that number dropped to a total of 29 conventions since April 2020. By drawing conventions back to San Francisco, the City is investing in the recovery of jobs and small businesses in its hospitality and entertainment industries, which bore the brunt of the economic impacts of COVID-19. Increased convention traffic brings hotel reservations, patrons to restaurants and bars and arts venues, and business to local shops and entertainment establishments. Based on the number of conventions currently considering San Francisco as a destination, the City expects the Moscone Convention funding will return approximately 140,000 to 150,000 room nights for San Francisco. This would generate almost \$173 million in direct convention spending and



almost \$5 million in Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT). The TOT tax, generated from each room night booked at a San Francisco hotel, goes into the City's General Fund to provide essential City services.

“Bringing back conventions, meetings and hotel room nights are critical to our economic health and future sustainability and viability,” said Kevin Carroll, President & CEO of the Hotel Council of San Francisco. “Full hotels mean full restaurants and mean a full recovery for San Francisco. Full hotels mean more work not only for hospitality employees but for the tens of thousands of jobs and small businesses they support.”

The Moscone Convention Recovery Fund complements other recovery initiatives such as “SFWednesdays,” a series of activations in public space throughout downtown, the Downtown Community Ambassadors, and the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan, all of which are aimed at increasing the return of San Francisco residents, commuters, and visitors to the downtown core of the City. A key aspect of the city's economic recovery strategy prioritizes the return of San Francisco's business and tourism industries – two industries that drive the city's economy and create significant support for small businesses throughout the downtown and the city's neighborhoods. Conventions support both these industries and advance broader economic vitality.

###