From: Aaron Goodman
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Cc: SherrillStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject: File #260537 (Housing Trust Fund) and/or File #260535 (Public Bank)
Date: Monday, June 22, 2026 3:13:53 AM

Brent Jalipa (Clerk of the commission)

Please note my support for a serious financial Housing Trust Fund, and public Bank to acquire the largest sites in SF for permanently affordable essential rental housing.

Per the SF Standard's recent article on Parkmerced and Robert Rosania, the financial implications and issues have gone on for WAY TOO LONG. People have been impacted financially and planning wise for their futures. Especially families and seniors living in the community.

Without the financial means to solve the lacking construction of affordable essential workforce housing of the size and scale of Parkmerced and other HOPE SF sites in SF there is a serious lacking vision for the importance of open space, layered gardens and protective spaces for people to live and meet daily.

The courtyards and towers can easily be re-imagined as a co-op or public housing space with infill to the parking garages with 2-3 story layered studio and granny flats for seniors and caretakers as a solution. Teacher housing and workforce housing was all in Parkmerced prior alongside stones town apartments.

To lose sight of this factor and the impacts of institutional growth (SFSU-CSU Masterplan) and its impacts on the westside housing loss is a critical miss-step in the SFBOS vision for housing and essential needs in the city.

As I worked on Parkmerced's issues, HOPE SF (SFHA - HD+MOD) and helped with micro and macro projects from transit connectivity and linking neighborhoods I see these issues as intertwined to the success of the areas and any rebuild that may occur.

Do not let developers "cash-out" and flip the essential housing needed in SF

BUY IT BACK starting with the largest properties in SF first….

Regards

Aaron Goodman D7

MISSION HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

474 Valencia St. Suite 280
San Francisco, CA. 94103
www.missionhousing.org
415-864-6432

June 18, 2026

Members of the Rules Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Housing Trust Fund Charter Amendment

Dear Chair Walton and Members of the Rules Committee:

For almost 55 years, Mission Housing Development Corporation has worked alongside San Francisco residents to create and preserve affordable homes, strengthen neighborhoods, and support communities facing displacement and rising costs. Our experience has shown us that housing stability is one of the most important foundations for a healthy and inclusive city.

We support placing the Housing Trust Fund Charter Amendment before San Francisco voters in November 2026 because our city needs a sustainable path to continue investing in affordable housing. The need is clear: families, seniors, and working residents across San Francisco are struggling to remain in the communities they call home, while too many affordable housing opportunities remain out of reach due to a lack of available funding.

The Housing Trust Fund would provide a critical local resource to help move affordable housing projects forward, preserve existing communities, and ensure that nonprofit housing organizations can continue delivering homes that serve San Franciscans for generations.

At Mission Housing, we know that affordable housing is not just about creating units. It is about creating opportunity, stability, and belonging. Investments in affordable housing strengthen neighborhoods, support local jobs, and help ensure San Francisco remains a city where people from all backgrounds can build a future.

We encourage the Rules Committee to advance this Charter Amendment to the November 2026 ballot and allow San Francisco voters to decide the future of this important investment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mission Housing Development Corporation

West of Twin Peaks Central Council
A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

WTPCC

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127
http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/

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

RE: Housing Trust Fund Charter Amendment - Request to Continue

Dear Chair and Members of the Rules Committee:

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council recognizes that housing affordability and housing production are among San Francisco's most important challenges. We support policies that increase housing opportunities, encourage housing construction, and help ensure that San Franciscans can continue to live and work in our city.

The question before the Committee is not whether housing is important.

The question is whether this particular Charter Amendment - which would dedicate future property-tax growth, expand the scope of the Housing Trust Fund, and bind future taxpayers and policymakers through 2058 - has received the level of public discussion, fiscal scrutiny, and accountability that a commitment of this magnitude deserves.

Our concern is that the measure is being presented primarily as an affordable housing initiative when it is also a significant fiscal and governance decision with long-term implications for future City budgets, taxpayer resources, and the ability of future elected officials to respond to changing priorities and unforeseen challenges.

The Controller's analysis makes clear that this measure would impose significant new General Fund obligations, beginning at approximately $6 million annually in FY 2028-29 and growing to approximately $60 million annually by FY 2034-35. The Controller further states that these expenditures would come from revenues that would otherwise remain available for future General Fund priorities and that the proposal is inconsistent with the City's voter-adopted policy discouraging additional spending mandates.

That finding alone warrants serious discussion.

A Thirty-Year Commitment of Future Revenues

This proposal would dedicate a growing share of future property-tax revenues to housing-related programs for more than three decades. Those revenues would otherwise remain available to support future infrastructure improvements, public safety needs, transportation investments, neighborhood services, economic recovery efforts, climate adaptation projects, or other priorities that future policymakers and voters may determine are most urgent.

Such a long-term commitment of public resources deserves a full public discussion regarding the tradeoffs involved. Yet many San Franciscans are only now learning of the breadth and duration of the proposal.

The measure would effectively divert future revenue growth away from other potential public investments for decades. Before making that commitment, voters deserve a clear understanding of the opportunity costs, tradeoffs, and long-term fiscal consequences. For homeowners and taxpayers, these tradeoffs are not

theoretical. As future City costs increase and General Fund flexibility declines, pressure inevitably grows for additional taxes, fees, assessments, and revenue measures. Residents who have invested in San Francisco's neighborhoods deserve a clear understanding of how a thirty-year dedication of future property-tax growth may influence future fiscal decisions and taxpayer obligations.

An Unusual Direction During a Period of Fiscal Uncertainty

The timing of this proposal raises additional questions.

City leaders have repeatedly emphasized the need for greater flexibility in responding to budget challenges, economic uncertainty, and changing public priorities. At a time when the City is seeking broader authority to manage its finances and allocate resources where they are most needed, this measure moves in the opposite direction by creating a new long-term spending mandate.

Future elected officials may face recessions, public safety challenges, major infrastructure failures, transportation needs, natural disasters, or other unforeseen circumstances. Dedicated spending requirements reduce the ability of future leaders to respond to those challenges as conditions evolve.

Moreover, this proposal would bind future Boards of Supervisors, future Mayors, and future voters to decisions being made today. Residents who do not yet own homes, taxpayers who do not yet live in San Francisco, and future generations of civic leaders would inherit these commitments without having participated in their creation. Such a long-term obligation warrants exceptional scrutiny and public discussion.

The Controller’s warning regarding reduced General Fund flexibility should not be dismissed lightly.

This Measure Does Far More Than Fund Affordable Housing

Public discussion has focused almost exclusively on affordable housing production.

However, the proposed Charter Amendment substantially expands the Housing Trust Fund into a much broader housing policy platform.

In addition to affordable housing production and preservation, the measure authorizes funding for:

• Social Housing Developments
• Limited-Equity Housing Cooperatives
• Acquisition of land and housing properties
• Public and nonprofit-owned housing models
• Housing stabilization programs
• Down-payment assistance programs
• Homeownership assistance programs for households earning up to 120% of Area Median Income
• Homeownership assistance for households that include first responders
• Housing-related infrastructure
• Bond financing programs backed by future revenues
• Administrative, legal, compliance, procurement, outreach, and operational costs associated with these programs

This is not simply an affordable housing funding measure.

It is a substantial expansion of housing policy, housing finance, housing ownership models, infrastructure spending authority, and administrative authority under a dedicated revenue stream that would continue until 2058. Also embedded is a workforce recruitment and retention tool subsidizing home purchase for public employees. Those benefits have traditionally been addressed through salaries, benefits, collective bargaining agreements, pension systems, workforce housing programs, and direct employer initiatives.

Voters deserve to understand the full scope of what they are being asked to approve.

Questions Regarding Developer Obligations and the Broader Housing Package

Another issue that deserves public discussion is the relationship between this Charter Amendment and the broader housing package currently being advanced by City leaders.

While this Charter Amendment does not itself reduce inclusionary housing requirements or development impact fees, numerous press accounts have reported that the measure is being advanced as part of a broader housing policy “deal” or “grand bargain.” Under that framework, a significant expansion of long-term public funding for affordable housing would occur alongside separate proposals to reduce certain developer obligations and housing-production costs.

Whether one agrees or disagrees with that approach, it represents a major policy choice regarding the balance between public and private responsibility for funding affordable housing.

Residents, taxpayers, neighborhood organizations, and homeowners have not been participants in these negotiations and have not been at the table as these discussions have occurred. As a result, much of the public’s understanding of the relationship between these proposals has come from media accounts rather than from a transparent public process.

If City leaders believe that dedicating future property-tax growth through 2058 is necessary to offset reductions in private-sector affordable housing obligations, that rationale should be fully disclosed, debated, and evaluated on its merits. Voters deserve a clear explanation of the complete policy framework being proposed and how responsibilities for affordable housing production may shift between developers and taxpayers over time.

Major changes involving both taxpayer commitments and developer obligations should not be assembled through parallel negotiations and presented as separate decisions. The public deserves an opportunity to understand the entire package before being asked to approve a multi-decade commitment of public resources.

Accountability and Oversight

Finally, the proposal leaves important questions regarding long-term oversight and accountability unanswered.

The City is being asked to dedicate substantial revenues to a wide range of housing programs over the next thirty years, yet it remains unclear what performance standards, reporting requirements, independent audits, or accountability mechanisms will govern those expenditures.

San Franciscans have seen significant public investments in housing over many years, yet concerns continue to be raised regarding production outcomes, administrative costs, project delivery, and overall effectiveness. Before voters commit future revenues through 2058, they deserve a clear understanding of how success will be measured, how funds will be monitored, and what safeguards will exist to ensure public resources are producing meaningful results.

Good intentions alone are not a substitute for strong governance and transparent oversight. Before expanding and extending a dedicated funding source through 2058, the City should also provide a comprehensive accounting of the outcomes achieved through existing housing expenditures. San Francisco has committed substantial public resources to housing programs over many years. Voters deserve clear information regarding production results, project delivery timelines, administrative costs, and overall effectiveness before being asked to approve an even larger long-term commitment of public revenues.

Homeowners and Taxpayers Deserve a Voice

For nearly ninety years, the West of Twin Peaks Central Council has represented neighborhood residents, homeowners, and taxpayers who care deeply about the long-term health of San Francisco. Those who invest in our neighborhoods, rely on City services, and contribute to the City's tax base deserve meaningful participation in decisions that dedicate public revenues and shape fiscal priorities for decades into the future.

Homeowners and neighborhood residents deserve the same seat at the table afforded to developers, nonprofit housing organizations, affordable housing advocates, and other special interests when long-term decisions affecting San Francisco and our public resources are being made.

Accordingly, we respectfully urge the Rules Committee to continue consideration of this proposal, broaden public outreach, fully evaluate the Controller’s fiscal findings, and ensure that voters receive a complete understanding of the long-term implications of this measure - not only for housing policy, but also for fiscal flexibility, taxpayer accountability, governance, oversight, and the future allocation of public revenues.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise LaPointe
President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Cc:

WTPCC Delegates and Officers

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Board of Supervisors