

**From:** [John Avalos](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [dennis.herrera@sfgov.org](mailto:dennis.herrera@sfgov.org); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Strategies to Maximize Affordable Housing, Land Use Item #7 Dec. 7, 2020  
**Date:** Monday, December 7, 2020 2:12:16 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing as the former Supervisor who spent years building the voice of community housing activists to foster public financial support and neighborhood acceptance of affordable housing in District 11, especially on public land.

District 11 is an area of our city that is heavily working class and yet has received much less than its fair share of publicly funded affordable development.

The Balboa Upper Yard at the Balboa Park Station is a model that we want to lift up for public lands development, but I have a significant concern about potential interference of the District 11 Supervisor on the original project that our community fought for and that the Mayor's Office of Housing awarded for development.

All in all, the city must operate on a set up standard affordable housing policies for public land and not on the interests of a single Supervisor or the developers on whose behalf they may intervene.

With the Upper Yard, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development funded community-based organizations to lead a community planning effort which recommended that the project serve a range of incomes from 30% - 50% AMIs to reflect the incomes of vulnerable and working class families in District 11, and this planning process was referenced in the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that MOHCD released to select a developer for the project.

However, the community is now learning that the AMIs for this project, and the only other project in District 11 at the Valente Marini Perata Mortuary site, have now been pushed up to as high as 105% of AMI.

This alteration is completely out of sync with the rest of the MOHCD portfolio of

similar projects, where up to 80% AMIs are the maximum allowed standard practice.

It is also completely out of sync with District 11, where the median household income is significantly lower than the 105% AMI proposed on public land at the Upper Yard. District 11's median household income is \$75, 235 for an entire household, much less than the \$94,150 limit to qualify for a single individual at the 105% AMI level.

When long fought for and hard-won affordable housing projects can be so altered after they have been received an award of public funding, it is clear that the city is failing to provide the public oversight that is essential to maximizing affordable housing development. To truly maximize affordable housing not just on public land but throughout the City our the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development must be protected from interference and political intervention that disrupt the delivery of the levels of affordability that our neighborhoods truly need. Perhaps a new City department responsible for affordable housing and community development with a City Commission with shared appointments from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor is in order. In that way, we may ensure that affordable housing on public land can be built on a single standard and be free from political intervention.

As you grapple with this issue, I urge you all to include in your set of standards for affordability for public land the consideration of the history of community participation that has gone into any public site set aside for affordable housing.

In the meantime, I hope that the Board of Supervisors can work to reset the levels of affordability back to what the community had envisioned and to what the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development had set in the award that they designated for the Upper Yard Project at the Balboa Park Station.

I urge the City Attorney to investigate any possible interference in the award by the District 11 Supervisor that has been made for the Upper Yard Project that has caused this project to deviate from the original parameters of the request for proposals for the upper yard as well as from common standards of affordable housing projects on San Francisco public land.

Sincerely,

John Avalos

Former District 11 Supervisor  
638 Paris St  
San Francisco, CA 94112

--

John Avalos for Supervisor 2020

[johnavalos2020@gmail.com](mailto:johnavalos2020@gmail.com)

415-359-8367

@avalosf twitter

@avalosf instagram

**From:** [pmonette-shaw](mailto:pmonette-shaw)  
**To:** [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Yu, Angelina \(BOS\)](#); [Fregosi, Ian \(BOS\)](#); [Chelsea.Boillard@sfgov.org](mailto:Chelsea.Boillard@sfgov.org); [Herzstein, Daniel \(BOS\)](#); [Bennett, Samuel \(BOS\)](#); [Mullan, Andrew \(BOS\)](#); [Falzon, Frankie \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Quan, Daisy \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Wright, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [RivamonteMesa, Abigail \(BOS\)](#); [Mcdonald, Courtney \(BOS\)](#); [Mahogany, Honey \(BOS\)](#); [Zou, Han \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Maybaum, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Vejby, Caitlin \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Temprano, Tom \(BOS\)](#); [Mundy, Erin \(BOS\)](#); [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#); [Goossen, Carolyn \(PDR\)](#); [Monge, Paul \(BOS\)](#); [Beinart, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Li-D9, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Evans, Abe \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Ho, Tim \(BOS\)](#); [Chinchilla, Monica \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Kilgore, Preston \(BOS\)](#); [Yu, Avery \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony on LUT Agenda Item #7, Strategies to Maximize Affordable Housing on Public Land  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 9, 2020 5:36:38 AM  
**Attachments:** [Testimony to BoS LUT Affordable Housing on Public Land 20-11-07.pdf](#)

---

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

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail:  
[pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

December 7, 2020

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee  
The Honorable Aaron Peskin, LUT Committee Chairperson  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, LUT Committee Member  
The Honorable Dean Preston, LUT Committee Member  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Testimony on Agenda Item #7,  
Strategies to Maximize Affordable Housing on Public Land**

Dear Chairperson Peskin and Land Use Committee Members,

For at least the last 22 months — nearly two years — the Board of Supervisors has dragged its feet to consider strategies to maximize creating affordable housing on public land, given planning that had been underway as far back as March 2019 (or earlier) to place “Prop E” on the November 2019 ballot.

In addition, there is the long, sordid history of trying to place affordable housing for teachers on the Francis Scott Key Annex public parcel, which is among the projects being funded by the *2015 Affordable Housing Bond*. As such, the Francis Scott Key housing project has been under the purview and oversight of CGOBOC (Citizen’s General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee) for several years now.

So, it’s somewhat ironic that the Board of Supervisors is just getting around to holding today’s

hearing to “*explore strategies to maximize creating affordable housing on public land.*” It’s kind of like Johnny-come-lately coming late to the party, two years late.

As part of today’s hearing, I urge the LUT Committee to require that MOHCD rapidly issue an inaugural quarterly report to CGOBOC on planned projects for the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*. Here we are 13 months after passage of the \$600 million bond in November 2019, and CGOBOC has not yet received any written reports from MOHCD describing projects planned for any of the various categories of affordable housing promised to voters in the bond. Yes, 13 months after the bond was passed by voters neither CGOBOC, nor members of the public, nor the Board of Supervisors have any idea of what specific affordable housing projects will receive funding from the *2019 Bond*. Why is MOHCD being so secretive about it? For that matter, why hasn’t CGOBOC demanded that it receive a written report from MOHCD?

I placed a public records request to MOHCD on December 4 asking for the initial status report prepared in 2020 by MOHCD reporting on progress on the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*, and any subsequent update reports on the *2019 Bond* following an initial progress report. MOHCD responded the same day, saying (lame):

*“We have no responsive records. No 2019 Affordable Housing GO Bonds have yet been issued as of today, hence no report.”*

That stands in stark contrast to the *2015 Affordable Housing Bond* (under then-Mayor Ed Lee). Just two months after voters approved the \$310 million *2015 Affordable Housing Bond* in November 2015, MOHCD presented an initial report to CGOBOC on January 28, 2016 and seven months later presented a detailed status update to CGOBOC on July 28, 2016 listing various projects — by name or street location — that would be funded by the *2015 Bond*.

Of note, the first bond tranche for the 2015 Bond wasn’t issued until October 19, 2016, but somehow by July 2016 MOHCD had issued public documents to CGOBOC listing specific projects that would be funded by the bond.

So, why is it that under Mayor Lee MOHCD presented details of proposed projects to be funded by the *2015 Bond* before the first bond tranche was actually issued in October 2016, but now under Mayor London Breed MOHCD is saying it can’t produce an initial report to CGOBOC and members of the public presenting details of proposed projects to be funded by the *2019 Bond* because the first 2019 bond tranche hasn’t been issued yet?

MOHCD did provide on December 4 a link to a Board of Supervisors agenda item to authorize the first issuance of the *2019 Bonds*. MOHCD indicated its presentation to the Board of Supervisors was its latest update, and indicated MOHCD “*wouldn’t consider it an initial status report.*”

The LUT Committee should require that MOHCD rapidly develop and immediately provide to CGOBOC and members of the public the initial planned projects to be funded by the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*.

Don’t let this opportunity go to waste!

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist,*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Norman Yee, Board President

The Honorable Sandra Lee Fewer, Supervisor, District 1

The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2

The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4

The Honorable Matt Haney, Supervisor, District 6

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8

The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9

The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Erica Major, Board of Supervisors Clerk to the Land Use and Transportation Committee

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

December 7, 2020

Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee  
The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Supervisor, LUT Committee Chairperson  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Supervisor, LUT Committee Member  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, LUT Committee Member  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Testimony on Agenda Item #7, Strategies to Maximize Affordable Housing on Public Land**

Dear Chairperson Peskin and Land Use Committee Members,

For at least the last 22 months — nearly two years — the Board of Supervisors has dragged its feet to consider strategies to maximize creating affordable housing on public land, given planning that had been underway as far back as March 2019 (or earlier) to place “Prop E” on the November 2019 ballot.

In addition, there is the long, sordid history of trying to place affordable housing for teachers on the Francis Scott Key Annex public parcel, which is among the projects being funded by the *2015 Affordable Housing Bond*. As such, the Francis Scott Key housing project has been under the purview and oversight of CGOBOC (Citizen’s General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee) for several years now.

So, it’s somewhat ironic that the Board of Supervisors is just getting around to holding today’s hearing to “*explore strategies to maximize creating affordable housing on public land.*” It’s kind of like Johnny-come-lately coming late to the party, two years late.

As part of today’s hearing, I urge the LUT Committee to require that MOHCD rapidly issue an inaugural quarterly report to CGOBOC on planned projects for the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*. Here we are 13 months after passage of the \$600 million bond in November 2019, and CGOBOC has not yet received any written reports from MOHCD describing projects planned for any of the various categories of affordable housing promised to voters in the bond. Yes, 13 months after the bond was passed by voters neither CGOBOC, nor members of the public, nor the Board of Supervisors have any idea of what specific affordable housing projects will receive funding from the *2019 Bond*. Why is MOHCD being so secretive about it? For that matter, why hasn’t CGOBOC demanded that it receive a written report from MOHCD?

I placed a public records request to MOHCD on December 4 asking for the initial status report prepared in 2020 by MOHCD reporting on progress on the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*, and any subsequent update reports on the *2019 Bond* following an initial progress report. MOHCD responded the same day, saying (lamely):

*“We have no responsive records. No 2019 Affordable Housing GO Bonds have yet been issued as of today, hence no report.”*

That stands in stark contrast to the *2015 Affordable Housing Bond* (under then-Mayor Ed Lee). Just two months after voters approved the \$310 million *2015 Affordable Housing Bond* in November 2015, MOHCD presented an initial report to CGOBOC on January 28, 2016 and seven months later presented a detailed status update to CGOBOC on July 28, 2016 listing various projects — by name or street location — that would be funded by the *2015 Bond*.

Of note, the first bond tranche for the 2015 Bond wasn’t issued until October 19, 2016, but somehow by July 2016 MOHCD had issued public documents to CGOBOC listing specific projects that would be funded by the bond.

So, why is it that under Mayor Lee MOHCD presented details of proposed projects to be funded by the *2015 Bond* before the first bond tranche was actually issued in October 2016, but now under Mayor London Breed MOHCD is saying it can’t produce an initial report to CGOBOC and members of the public presenting details of proposed projects to be funded by the *2019 Bond* because the first 2019 bond tranche hasn’t been issued yet?

December 7, 2020

**Testimony on Agenda Item #7, *Strategies to Maximize Affordable Housing on Public Land***

Page 2

MOHCD did provide on December 4 a link to a Board of Supervisors agenda item to authorize the first issuance of the *2019 Bonds*. MOHCD indicated its presentation to the Board of Supervisors was its latest update, and indicated MOHCD “*wouldn’t consider it an initial status report.*”

The LUT Committee should require that MOHCD rapidly develop and immediately provide to CGOBOC and members of the public the initial planned projects to be funded by the *2019 Affordable Housing Bond*.

Don’t let this opportunity go to waste!

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist,*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Norman Yee, Board President

The Honorable Sandra Lee Fewer, Supervisor, District 1

The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2

The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4

The Honorable Matt Haney, Supervisor, District 6

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8

The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9

The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Erica Major, Board of Supervisors Clerk to the Land Use and Transportation Committee



**From:** [Helena B](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Subject:** Comment re: Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery (File 201151)— amendments recommended  
**Date:** Monday, December 7, 2020 12:35:27 PM

---

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

Dear Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

As a San Francisco resident (D9) committed to climate action and equity, I am writing to recommend amendments to the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery ordinance (File 201151).

The ordinance as written (Version 1) takes incremental steps towards reducing waste through establishing a permitting process and increasing the required percentage of diverted materials. I would like to see the ordinance also maximize opportunities to improve equity, and mitigate the climate and air quality impacts attributable to unrecovered landfill residuals.

In order to accomplish this, I ask that you amend the ordinance as follows:

1. Create community/local job requirements that must be met by transporters and facilities as defined in the ordinance;
2. Add a carbon and air quality impact fee starting at \$62 per ton (tied to the social cost of carbon, indexed for inflation) of landfilled waste, and redistribute proceeds to air and climate pollution mitigation measures directly benefiting communities impacted by demolition.

These amendments would help reduce carbon emissions and construction and demolition debris through incentivizing reuse of carbon intensive material. They would also provide community jobs and benefits on the order of \$10 million per year in funds for air and climate mitigation to impacted residents based on the ordinance's existing estimate of landfilled and incinerated debris.

As you well know, [75% of new development is slated for the Southeast corridor](#) in San Francisco, an area historically overburdened by poor air quality and environmental toxins. The impact fees generated by the proposed amendments, if reinvested in those communities, can help address historic damages and mitigate ongoing and future environmental impacts. For example, the fees could support weatherization and energy efficiency efforts, the electrification of home appliances to reduce indoor and outdoor air pollution attributable to methane combustion and leakage, and the expansion of EV charging infrastructure, among myriad other climate-positive initiatives that should be determined in consultation with local communities and community groups. At the same time, job requirements in those areas would provide economic opportunities in regions experiencing significant

gentrification and displacement.

As well as funding climate-related local initiatives, the impact fee will also serve as an incentive to divert debris above the ordinance's requirement of 75%. This is crucial, since the embodied carbon (i.e. the carbon dioxide emitted in creating the material) of debris is not included in our emissions inventory but is staggeringly high. [Cement and steel, for example, each have an embodied carbon content of about 1 ton per ton of material.](#) Other materials vary, but with cement as an estimate, the 1.5 million tons of debris generated annually in San Francisco would add up to 25% to San Francisco's greenhouse gas emissions if included in its city-wide inventory. We need to seriously consider the impact of our consumption, and adding an impact fee to this ordinance would be a major step in the right direction.

As members of the Board of Supervisors, you have a major opportunity to address key concerns around equity and climate through this ordinance. Please include the recommended amendments.

Thank you,

Helena Birecki

D9 Constituent

**From:** [Robin Cooper](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfclimateemergency.org](mailto:info@sfclimateemergency.org)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery (File 201151)  
**Date:** Monday, December 7, 2020 2:00:42 PM

---

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

***ROBIN COOPER, MD***

---

*1132 Dolores St.  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
415-642-0144  
FAX: 451-821-9934  
Email: [robincooper50@gmail.com](mailto:robincooper50@gmail.com)*

Dec. 7, 2020:

Subject: Public Comment re: Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery (File 201151)

To Whom It May Concern:

As a physician, I am deeply concerned about the dual impacts on escalating global warming and the associated problems of air pollution. As we know too well, the impacts of both are most heavily born by low income communities and communities of color. That is why the amendments to the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery ordinance (File 201151) before this committee today are so essential.

The amendments that should be incorporated are:

1. Create community/local job requirements that must be met by transporters and facilities as defined in the ordinance;
2. Add a carbon and air quality impact fee starting at \$62 per ton (tied to the social cost of carbon, indexed for inflation) of landfilled waste, and redistribute proceeds to air and climate pollution mitigation measures directly benefiting communities impacted by demolition.

These amendments offer opportunities to address the enormous problems posed by debris and waste with capacities to mitigate the climate and air pollutant effects of landfill from construction debris.

By assessing a “carbon and air quality” fee on landfill waste, builders will be incentivized to reuse carbon intensive materials thus contributing to reduction in emissions.

Reinvesting the revenue from a fee to utilize for mitigation efforts directly in the communities impacted will assist with the health burdens these underserved communities, primarily in the Southeast sector, now face.

Hiring community residents for the workforce implementation will bring disparately needed economic opportunities to these communities.

The incorporation of the amendments proposed is a win/win which has the potential to impact climate change by reducing emissions, improve health by improved air pollution and improve impoverished communities with supporting economic opportunities.

This is the opportunity to address climate, health and equity. I urge you to adopt these amendments.

Sincerely,

Robin Cooper, MD  
Associate Clinical Professor,  
Dept of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences  
University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine