From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 260538 - Inclusionary Housing - 3 Letters
Date:	Thursday, July 9, 2026 2:23:11 PM
Attachments:	File No. 260538 Inclusionary Housing - 3 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 260538:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) reduce Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirements for projects of 25 units or more; 2) delete Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirements for projects under 25 units; 3) allow all projects to dedicate land to the City as an alternative to payment of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program fee; 4) adopt a process for projects to request a modification to conditions of approval related to Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirements; 5) delete certain Article 4 affordable housing and development impact fees; and 6) adopt conforming amendments to various sections of the Planning Code; amending the Building Code to reduce Planning Code Article 4 development impact fees and allow deferral of payment of such fees; and amending the Administrative Code to adopt conforming amendments to the requirements of the Citywide Affordable Housing Fund; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
justice.alcantar@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); CPC-Commissions Secretary; So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); MahmoodStaff; WongStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Subject: Re: Support Amending the Inclusionary Housing Program - Justin Truong
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 5:15:24 PM

From: justintruong56@gmail.com
Subject: Support Amending the Inclusionary Housing Program
To the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and Mayor Lurie,

We support the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation to amend and reduce the Inclusionary Housing Program requirements.

As a result, we encourage the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to pass the recommendations made by the Technical Advisory Committee. Specifically to:

1) reduce the on-site affordable rates from 12-15% to 5%,
2) reduce the offsite rates from 20%-20.5% to 10%,
3) eliminating area specific inclusionary housing fees
4) deleting certain Article 4 affordable housing and development impact fees

These types of reforms that provide a better chance for existing pipeline projects to get built is exactly what ConnectedSF has expressed interest in supporting in the past year.

Reducing or outright cutting various line items that result in added costs to build housing at a time when various costs are at an all-time high is not benefiting people looking to move to San Francisco, residents of San Francisco, nor the City as a whole.

We appreciate these reform efforts and would encourage taking this initiative a step further by completely removing the inclusionary affordable housing program to market rate development.

Sincerely,

Justin Truong

From:	Rey Javier
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Ng, Wilson (POL); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Request for Reasonable Accommodation for Public Comment
Date:	Thursday, July 2, 2026 6:20:50 PM

To The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors:

Good morning. In connection with Item 260538 for July 7, 2026, hearing, I am reaching out to ask for a reasonable accommodation request to have my public comment read by the clerk during the meeting (when floor is open for public comments), please:

My name is Rey Javier. I am a housing and community advocate in San Francisco. I live and work in San Francisco.

I previously served the Mayor's Office of Housing in San Francisco, as a Civil Servant. During that time, i was responsible for assisting with the program administration and operations of the Inclusionary Housing program for 8 years, under now Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Executive Directors Douglas Shoemaker, Olson Lee and Matt Franklin.

I am reaching out today to encourage the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the authors of the amendments of the Inclusionary Housing Program to consider increasing the requirements, instead of decreasing the required number of units, increasing the inclusionary in-lieu fees and the overall oversight for the Program.

Inclusionary must work for all neighborhoods and districts, so that the benefit of housing is equitable throughout the City. The problem here is not about the program or the Trust Fund, but the archaic zoning laws. There are improvements that can be made to the program, including having a fresh new set of staff.

In case you did not know, the current technical advisory committee involved with the Inclusionary program does not have a term limit. This needs must change immediately. The City and County should place a term limit for this committee, and the appointees considered should have work or lived experience, so that new and creative ideas can be formed, and apply best practices.

We do not need reductions, we need additions.

As an advocate for housing and the homeless, I also ask, please, if you would review and amend the program to shaving a larger portion of the collected in-lieu fee funding towards homelessness rapid rehousing programs. As you know - the funds for homelessness efforts are being cut by the Federal Government, as we speak. With San Francisco's homelessness crisis, we all need to find a holistic, healthy and positive solutions to help solve this problem.

Finally, I ask the the City and County Board of Supervisors to please create a Commission to monitor the number of Mayoral Appointed positions at MOHCD. The City needs people who actually live in our neighborhoods in the City and do the work hands-on, and not two to three layers of appointed positions. For the record, there are appointees who have been in their posts at MOHCD for over twenty years. Are these supposed to be lifetime jobs, after 4-5 Mayoral Administrations?

Having said the above, I thank all of you for the work that you do. Thank you.

Rey Javier
San Francisco Housing and Community Advocate
www.linkedin.com/in/reyjavier

From:	factory 1 design
To:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Herrera, Ana (BOS)
Subject:	USM letter - File no. 260538, Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions
Date:	Wednesday, July 8, 2026 10:23:49 AM
Attachments:	TAC INCLUSIONARY 2026.pdf

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors-

Please find the attached letter regarding the Inclusionary Housing Program Update and Reductions.

Thank you.

Larisa Pedroncelli
Member, United to Save the Mission

UNITED TO SAVE THE MISSION

July 8, 2026

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

Re: File no. 260538, Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions

On behalf of United to Save the Mission's more than one dozen organizations, we ask that you honor the city's historic equity frameworks and retain a higher level of inclusionary housing for the Mission District, which has lost many thousands of low-income residents and small businesses – having lost 12,000 Latino residents since 2000.

The Neighborhood's needs are not the same – its displacement risks are not the same – nor is its ability to build market-rate housing.

The Mission is one of the three neighborhoods that has retained a historically higher threshold of inclusionary requirements, in recognition of its devastating community losses. At the same time, developers continued to build or fee out on several market rate projects at a higher rate than is proposed right now – *even during Covid*.

We think that these other neighborhoods with historic additional inclusionary housing -- the Tenderloin and SoMa, should also retain additional retention benefits considering the size of their affordable housing need. This retention is particularly important when weighed in the context of the lack of a *full link between these inclusionary cuts to replacing the lost units with the passage of the Housing Trust Fund – and the lack of a clear city commitment that these inclusionary cuts will be reversed to 10% if the fund fails to pass – as the recent GAO Hearing discussions underlined for all of us.*

While the current fee-cut proposal recognizes and honors our historic equity protection framework for these neighborhoods in the areas of off-site, fee out, and land dedication rates – *it entirely skips it for the onsite inclusionary.* This creates only the unhelpful illusion of an equity framework – as nearly all developers will opt to use the low citywide rate of 5% instead.

The retention of an 8% rate for the Mission and other equity geographies would recognize the current economic environment, while retaining the city's historic equity framework.

Many years of community/city partnership planning went into the establishment of this framework, and it is important to retain and honor the city's equity commitments in order to meet its AFFH requirement to "transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity."

These equitable housing commitments can be seen in many core city documents including:

- The San Francisco Housing Element
    - Which contains countless affordable housing commitments that would urge the honoring of this equity framework, including:
        - Action 1.5.1 - Where the city committed to "Increase production of housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households."
        - Action 4.1.7 - Where the city committed to "target levels of investments that prevent community displacement through increased permanently affordable housing production."

- The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan
    - Which contains a city/community agreement to formalize the potential conversion of up to half of the city's industrial spaces under a new zoning – Urban Mixed Use – *but only in exchange for recapturing additional community value* in those formerly good-paying blue-collar job spaces through a higher inclusionary housing level. Dropping this higher requirement (rather than naming it as part of a fair 8% outcome), would trade away further critical blue-collar job spaces without the promised community benefits.

- Mission Action Plans 2020 and 2030
    - Acknowledge throughout the role that inclusionary units play an important role in achieving the neighborhoods affordable housing goals and meeting the needs of its residents.

Leaving behind our equitable housing frameworks is particularly concerning when weighed in the context of the recent Karen Chapple study (*Can New Housing Supply Mitigate Displacement and Exclusion?, 2024*) showing that without very large amounts of accompanying affordable housing, market-rate housing in San Francisco can be expected to contribute to displacing existing low-income residents by roughly 11-14%.

In summary: without an improved onsite inclusionary level that brings some parity with its offsite, fee out, and land dedication rates – the Mission can expect further blue-collar job losses and increased low-income resident displacement.

Thank you,

United to Save the Mission

The Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) consists of 18 neighborhood-based affordable housing and community development organizations whose mission is to foster the development of permanently affordable low-income housing under community control and through non-speculative means of ownership, with adequate provisions for tenant empowerment and services, and homeownership opportunities.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Equity Concerns Regarding the Proposed Reduction of Inclusionary Housing Requirements (Board File No. 260538)

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board:

The Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO) writes to share our concerns about the proposed ordinance reducing the City's inclusionary housing requirements and development impact fees. CCHO is a coalition, founded in 1978, of nonprofit affordable housing developers, community organizers, and tenant advocates.

In 2002, CCHO helped author the City's original inclusionary housing ordinance, and we have spent the decades since working to ensure that San Francisco's growth produces housing that working families, longtime residents, and our most impacted communities can actually afford.

We write in that spirit. We share the goal of getting housing built, and we recognize that the current market has made many projects difficult to finance. But how the City responds to a temporary downturn is itself a policy choice with lasting consequences.

Inclusionary requirements exist precisely so that the value created by new development is shared with the broader community rather than captured entirely by private investment. A feasibility measure aimed at near-term production should not permanently rewrite that equity commitment—particularly in the neighborhoods that have borne the longest history of disinvestment and displacement.

We therefore respectfully urge the Board to recommend the following modifications before approving this ordinance.

1. Provide a path back toward pre-reduction levels as the market recovers. Rather than locking in a permanent 5% rate, the ordinance should include a mechanism—tied to the Technical Advisory Committee's triennial review or to defined market-recovery triggers—that restores inclusionary requirements toward pre-reduction levels as feasibility improves. A reduction tied to current conditions should expire with those conditions, not outlast them.

2. Retain the 10-unit applicability threshold, and reject the permanent exemption of projects under 25 units. Raising the threshold to 25 units would permanently exempt a large share of future development from any affordable housing obligation, with disproportionate effects in lower-scale neighborhoods.

3. Preserve the geographic anti-displacement requirements in the Mission, SoMa, and the Eastern Neighborhoods. These protections were adopted in direct response to documented displacement pressure, and that pressure has not abated.

4. Protect the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee (Section 413) and the community-stabilization fees from the proposed 67% reduction. These are dedicated affordable-housing and anti-displacement revenue streams—including the contribution that commercial development makes through the Linkage Fee—and they should not be swept into a feasibility measure aimed at housing production.

We want to underscore why the threshold and anti-displacement provisions matter so much, using the example of the 3rd Street corridor in Bayview-Hunters Point.

The corridor is defined by historically lower land values, decades of public and private disinvestment, and predominantly low-scale development, where many future projects are likely to be smaller than 25 units. That same disinvestment has suppressed land values relative to the rest of the city, creating a substantial gap between what land is worth today and what it could yield through redevelopment—a gap that draws speculative investment as soon as conditions shift.

Raising the inclusionary threshold from 10 units to 25 would allow developers to build 24-unit market-rate buildings with no affordable housing requirement at all, sharpening the incentive to acquire undervalued property and capture that value through market-rate development.

In a historically disinvested, low-income community, those incentives can accelerate speculation and a new wave of gentrification, directing the value created by redevelopment to private investors rather than to the surrounding community. The likely results are mounting displacement pressure on low-income households and community-serving small businesses, rising residential and commercial rents, and a faster erosion of the neighborhood's stability.

These stakes are especially acute in Bayview-Hunters Point, widely recognized as San Francisco's last historically Black neighborhood and cultural enclave, at a time when Black residents make up less than five percent of the city's population.

The neighborhood is home to the San Francisco African American Arts & Cultural District (SFAAACD), whose vision is "a robust, economically vibrant Black community that adds to the rich cultural tapestry of San Francisco" and whose mission is to advance, cultivate, enrich, and advocate for African American equity, cultural stability, and economic vitality.

Weakening affordable housing requirements in one of the few neighborhoods where Black families retain longstanding roots risks limiting the ability of existing residents to remain as investment returns. Without strong affordability requirements, redevelopment may hasten the out-migration of Black residents and legacy small businesses—undermining the neighborhood's cultural identity and eroding one of the last centers of Black homeownership, entrepreneurship, arts, and community life in San Francisco.

None of these recommendations asks the Board to abandon its housing production goals. Each asks that the path to more housing not run through a permanent rollback of the City's equity commitments, and that any relief offered to development be calibrated to present conditions and to the communities that stand to lose the most.

We would welcome the opportunity to work with the Board and staff to refine these provisions, and we thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Quintin Mecke
Executive Director
Council of Community Housing Organizations