From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Housing Action Coalition letter of objection to the Affordable Housing Production Act.
Date:	Wednesday, July 20, 2022 4:20:09 PM
Attachments:	HAC letter BoS July 19 2022.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Housing Action Coalition regarding File Nos. 220631 and 220835.

File No. 220631 - Charter Amendment, Initiative Ordinance, and Policy Declaration - Affordable Housing Production Act

File No. 220835 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Charter Amendment, Initiative Ordinance, and Policy Declaration - Affordable Housing Production Act - July 19, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Deborah Schneider <deborah@housingactioncoalition.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 4:44 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Navarrete, Joy (CPC) <joy.navarrete@sfgov.org>; Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Housing Action Coalition letter of objection to the Affordable Housing Production Act.

Dear Supervisors,

Attached for your records is a digital version of the letter of objection to the Affordable Housing Production Act.

Jake Price, who spoke on HAC's behalf at public comment, attempted to deliver the hard copy of the letter and all its accompanying exhibits to the Clerk's Office, but the submittal was refused in hard copy format.

I am therefore sending the letter separately from the exhibits, which we will assemble into a single file and send separately.

Thank you,

Deborah

--

Deborah Schneider | Pronouns: She/Her
Communications Director | Housing Action Coalition
50 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 541-9001 | Cell: (415) 637-3686

deborah@housingactioncoalition.org | housingactioncoalition.org

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

July 19, 2022

President Walton
President of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Affordable Housing Production Act; BOS File Nos. 220631 & 220835

Dear President Walton and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition ("HAC"), a member-supported nonprofit that advocates for building more homes at all levels of affordability, I write to urge the Board of Supervisors ("Board") not to put the sham Affordable Housing Production Act ("Chan/Peskin Measure" at **Exhibit A**) before the voters. There is already a measure - the "Affordable Homes Now Initiative" ("Citizen Measure") - to create a streamlined approval process for projects that provide more affordable housing than required. Roughly 80,000 San Franciscans (16% of registered voters) signed the Citizen Measure. (Citizen Measure at **Exhibit B**.)

The Chan/Peskin Measure is not being put forward to streamline housing production. It is a cynical ploy to confuse and distract voters and divide the pro-housing vote. For the Board to place this on the ballot would be both illegal and unethical; unlike measures put on the ballot by citizen signature, the Chan/Peskin Measure cannot be placed on the ballot before environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") is completed. The Chan/Peskin Measure has not done this for one simple reason: time. There isn't enough of it to do an environmental review and qualify in time to sabotage the Citizen Measure, which will be on the November 2022 ballot. Should the Board illegally place the Chan/Peskin measure on the ballot, the HAC is prepared to immediately pursue all legal remedies available.

The Measures

On the surface, both the Chan/Peskin Measure and the Citizen Measure appear similar. Both proposals would streamline city approval for three kinds of qualifying projects — 100 percent affordable housing, teacher housing, and mixed-use projects. Both proposals require that labor is paid a prevailing wage, and both proposals involve an increase in affordable units for qualifying projects. However, there's a key difference: the higher affordability requirements in the Chan/Peskin Measure will be feasible for a more limited subset of projects and will result in fewer developers using it.

Here's how the figures break down and what it means for home builders. Let's say a developer wants to build a 100-unit project. Currently, San Francisco requires that 21.5 percent of homes in larger projects are designated affordable, so the 100-unit project would need to include 22 homes that are below market rate ("BMR").

The Citizen Measure would require a project to meet the 21.5 percent figure, plus 15 percent of the bonus affordable units. For example, to qualify, that 100 unit-project would now have to build 25 BMR homes.

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

The Chan/Peskin Measure, however, further increases the overall affordability requirement by 8 percent, so instead of 21.5 percent it would be 29.5 percent BMR homes. That means the 100-unit project would be required to designate 30 BMR homes. It also requires higher percentages of two- and three-bedroom units.

On the surface, the Chan/Peskin Measure appears to be the measure that more effectively addresses San Francisco's shortage of affordable homes. Even in San Francisco, everyone can agree that 30 affordable homes are better than 25.

However, for new homes to be built in the first place, they must be financially feasible for the homebuilders. The additional 8 percent of affordable housing that the Chan/Peskin Measure requires, won't necessarily result in more affordable homes being built because fewer multi-family projects will be feasible. Nonetheless, for some developers, the added cost associated with the higher affordable requirements may outweigh holding costs in a high interest rate environment with the risk of change in economic conditions during a lengthy approval process.

1. The Chan/Peskin Measure's CEQA Review Is Inadequate.

a. The "No Project" Determination Is Specious.

In the race to qualify the Chan/Peskin Measure for the November 2022 ballot, the public has been misled by CEQA findings stating:

> The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this proposed Charter Amendment and ordinance comply with [CEQA]…Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors…and is incorporated herein by reference.

(Chan/Peskin Measure Sec. 1. at **Exhibit A**.) However, there is no environmental analysis in the file beyond a conclusory statement lacking any analysis whatsoever appended to the Clerk of the Board's request for environmental evaluation. It reads:

> Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

(July 14, 2022 CEQA Determination at **Exhibit C**.) This determination cannot withstand even the most cursory scrutiny under CEQA.

b. CEQA's Definition of a Project.

Under CEQA, a "project" is an activity (1) undertaken or funded by or requiring the approval of a public agency that (2) "may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment." (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 21065.) Zoning changes, even minor ones, are typically considered "projects" for CEQA purposes. The California Supreme Court held that a zoning change to allow medical marijuana dispensaries (4 in each city council district; 36 citywide) was a project under CEQA in *Union of Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego*, 7 Cal. 5th 1171 (2019).

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

The question posed in determining whether an ordinance is a project "is not whether the activity will affect the environment, or what those effects might be, but whether the activity's potential for causing environmental change is sufficient to justify the further inquiry into its actual effects that will follow from the application of CEQA." (*Id.* at 1198.) If the proposed activity is the sort that is capable of causing direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on the environment, some type of environmental review is justified, and the activity must be deemed a project." (*Id.*) In *Union of Marijuana Patients*, the Court determined:

> the establishment of new stores could cause a citywide change in patterns of vehicle traffic from the businesses' customers, employees, and suppliers. The necessary causal connection between the Ordinance and these effects is present because adoption of the Ordinance was "an essential step culminating in action [the establishment of new businesses] which may affect the environment."

(*Id.* at 1199.)

c. The Chan/Peskin Measure Is a Project and Must Complete an Environmental Review.

The Chan/Peskin Measure's own findings contradict a determination that it is not a Project under CEQA. Its provisions for "[a]ccelerated review will allow San Francisco to incentivize and accelerate the development of housing projects that specifically expand the city's affordable housing supply by reducing the time and expense associated with obtaining planning approval." (Sec. 2(n).) A program that aims for more and faster housing construction obviously qualifies as a "project" capable of causing direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on the environment.

This is particularly true given the Chan/Peskin Measure's substantive changes to the rules governing qualified projects. Those projects would not be subject to CEQA review by virtue of being ministerial. CEQA requires the imposition of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels where feasible and consistent with project objectives. However, by making projects ministerial and subject to objective standards only, there is no mechanism for commonplace impacts to be mitigated.

It is impossible to square the rationale used to classify the Chan/Peskin Measure as not being a project, when the City's Housing Element Update (see **Exhibit D**), which merely sets the stage for future changes, was classified as a project. The Draft EIR for the Housing Element Update (see **Exhibit E**) states:

> The housing element update would modify the policies of the general plan's housing element. It would not implement specific changes to existing land use controls (e.g., zoning) or approve any physical development (e.g., construction of housing or infrastructure). [Citation Omitted] As such, the proposed action would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. Instead, the housing element update would result in reasonably foreseeable indirect changes. Specifically, the department assumes that adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions, such as planning code amendments to increase

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stre
San Francisco, CA 941
(415) 541.90
info@housingactioncoalition.o
housingactioncoalition.o

> height limits along transit corridors and to modify density controls in low-density areas that are primarily located on the west and north sides of the city, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update.

(Page S-2.)

> As such, the housing element update would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. Instead, the housing element update would result in reasonably foreseeable indirect changes. Specifically, the department assumes that adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions, such as planning code amendments to increase height limits along transit corridors and modify density controls in low- density areas that are primarily located on the north and west sides of the city, designation of housing sustainability districts, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update. Therefore, this EIR identifies the reasonably foreseeable impacts of future actions that would implement the proposed goals, policies, and actions, including rezoning actions that would enable increased housing density.

(Page 4-4.)

d. The Chan/Peskin measure will result in environmental impacts that should be evaluated at the project-level and cumulatively.

CEQA requires the imposition of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels where feasible and consistent with project objectives. However, by making projects ministerial and subject to objective standards only, there is no mechanism to require mitigation of common impacts:

- **Noise and vibration.** Because most San Francisco developments are built lot-line to lot-line, mitigation measures are often needed to reduce construction noise to acceptable levels. Where deep excavations occur near older buildings, particularly historic ones, mitigation measures are often required to avoid damaging adjacent structures. (See 1010V Mission Street, Mitigated Neg. Dec. at **Exhibit F**; see also 1101 Sutter Initial Study at **Exhibit G.**)

- **Transportation impacts/mitigation** are also common in San Francisco, particularly for projects where loading docks and driveways are on busy pedestrian or vehicular streets, are on narrow streets, have poor visibility, or where multiple projects are under construction in close proximity. Mitigation measures are needed to address transportation impacts.

- **Archeological resources.** Archeological resources are commonplace in San Francisco. Mitigation measures to test for the presence of archeological resources, evaluate their significance, and for preservation (either on- or off-site) are often required. (See 1010V

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

Mission Street, Mitigated Neg. Dec. at **Exhibit F**; see also Housing Element Update DEIR Maps at **Exhibit E**.)

- **Air Quality.** Construction equipment frequently generates diesel particulate and other emissions. For larger projects near residential buildings, schools, and other sensitive receptors, emissions may cause significant exposures and health risks without mitigation measures. (See 1101 Sutter DEIR at **Exhibit G.**)

- **Historic Resources.** Under CEQA, environmental impacts on a "historic resource" must be analyzed. Historic resources are broadly defined to include any building eligible for listing on the California Register, or actually listed on other state and local registers. Demolition of a historic resource is a significant impact under CEQA. The Peskin/Chan Measure allows for ministerial demolition of non-residential buildings that are considered historic resources under CEQA but do not fall within the Peskin/Chan Measure's narrower class of protected historic buildings, along with more extensive alterations to certain contributory buildings listed in Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code. Buildings like the one at 3140 16th Street have been preserved by virtue of their eligible status and would be at heightened risk of demolition, as would numerous small-scale historic resources. These potentially significant impacts must be disclosed in an EIR before the measure is put to the vote on the ballot. (See 1101 Sutter DEIR at **Exhibit G**, 3140 16th St. records at **Exhibit H**; see also Historic Resources at **Exhibit I**.)

- **Cumulative Impacts.** All potential cumulative impacts should be studied, particularly in relation to the policy changes proposed in the Housing Element Update. In particular, due to the concentration of eligible historic buildings on the City's east side and the relatively permissive development controls, the Chan/Peskin Measure could conflict with the Update's goal of shifting more development to the west side and further burden public services on the east side. (See Housing Element Draft 3 Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Actions at **Exhibit D**)

2. Supervisors Cannot Bypass CEQA In Order to Place A Competing Measure on the Ballot.

In a case factually similar to the Chan/Peskin Measure, the California Supreme Court clearly held that the discretionary submission of a ballot measure to the voters by a local legislature is not exempt from CEQA. (*Friends of Sierra Madre v. City of Sierra* (2001) 25 Cal 4th 165.) The measure in *Friends* sought to delist 29 properties from the city's historic register and was placed on the ballot over objections that the delisting required CEQA analysis. The city took the position that delisting was not a project, and the ballot measure ultimately passed. However, the court invalidated the measure for the City's failure to comply with CEQA, agreeing with the Court of Appeals reasoning that the delisting would lead to a change in legal status under CEQA:

> Although the city might still have the power to review the historical significance of the property when a demolition permit was sought, delisting might have the effect of removing the property from CEQA requirements for other types of use, for building permits for alteration, and for relocation of the property. Thus, delisting constituted a project with an effect that might cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

(*Id.* at 182.) The Chan/Peskin Measure effectively removes a large number of properties from all CEQA requirements for qualified projects, while ignoring its clear duty to conduct an environmental review. Notably, the City and County of San Francisco argued in an amicus brief that "requiring CEQA compliance for city- council-generated initiatives will handicap a city in responding to a voter-sponsored land use initiative by offering its own alternative because the process of CEQA compliance cannot be completed before the voter-sponsored initiative must be placed on the ballot." (*Id.* at 191.) The Court dismissed the argument and declined to create a legal loophole, noting elsewhere that:

> Voters who are advised that an initiative has been placed on the ballot by the city council will assume that the city council has done so only after itself making a study and thoroughly considering the potential environmental impact of the measure. For that reason a preelection EIR should be prepared and considered by the city council before the council decides to place a council-generated initiative on the ballot. By contrast, voters have no reason to assume that the impact of a voter-sponsored initiative has been subjected to the same scrutiny and, therefore, will consider the potential environmental impacts more carefully in deciding whether to support or oppose the initiative.

(*Id.* at 190.)

The sponsors of the Chan/Peskin Measure are surely aware of the City's obligations under CEQA. Each of the six sponsors voted to overturn the EIR for a large housing development at 469 Stevenson Street on grounds including the scale of the building in relation to nearby historic buildings. (Board of Supervisors Motion No. M21-182 at **Exhibit J**.) This decision, along with other housing disapprovals, prompted the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") to review the Board's actions as a possible violation of the Housing Accountability Act. The HCD expressed concern that these "actions are indicative of review processes that may be constraining the provision of housing in San Francisco." (See **Exhibit K**.) Now the same supervisors whose actions are being scrutinized by the HCD for disapproving residential projects are ignoring legal obligations under CEQA in a mad dash to manipulate the results of a citizen-sponsored, pro-housing measure. This is bad faith violation of due process and subjects the Chan/Peskin Measure to a preelection legal challenge. (*Yes on Measure A v. City of Lake Forest* (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 620, 626 ("preelection challenges are desirable because "the presence of an invalid measure on the ballot steals attention, time and money from the numerous valid propositions on the same ballot. It will confuse some voters and frustrate others, and an ultimate decision that the measure is invalid, coming after the voters have voted in favor of the measure, tends to denigrate the legitimate use of the initiative procedure." [citations omitted]").)

Conclusion

The Chan/Peskin Measure is a transparently fraudulent attempt to confuse and divide voters with the sole purpose of undermining the Citizen Measure. It is being rushed to the ballot for political reasons. Too rushed. So rushed, in fact, that it is has not gone through the normal procedural steps required for a measure placed on the ballot by the Supervisors, including, crucially, environmental review under CEQA. This fatal flaw subjects the Measure to a preelection legal challenge that will prevent the Measure from reaching the ballot. On behalf of the 16% of

HOUSING ACTION COALITION

50 Otis Stree
San Francisco, CA 9410
(415) 541.900
info@housingactioncoalition.or
housingactioncoalition.or

San Francisco voters who signed the Citizen Measure, HAC will vigorously assert its rights to due process, to compel the city to comply with CEQA, and ensure that an invalid measure does not confuse and divide the pro-housing vote.

Corey Smith, *Executive Director*
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

CC:

Connie Chan - ChanStaff@sfgov.org

Matt Dorsey - DorseyStaff@sfgov.org

Rafael Mandelman – MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org

Gordon Mar – Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org

Myrna Melgar – MelgarStaff@sfgov.org

Aaron Peskin – Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org

Dean Preston – Dean.Preston@sfgov.org

Hillary Ronen – Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org

Ahsha Safai – Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

Catherine Stefani – Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org

Shamann Walton – Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

Angela Calvillo - Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Erica Major – Erica.Major@sfgov.org

Joy Navarrete – joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

Lisa Gibson – lisa.gibson@sfgov.org

From:	Somera, Alisa (BOS)
To:	Young, Victor (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: We need your help
Date:	Monday, July 18, 2022 5:30:37 PM

For your respective files.

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 5:01 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: We need your help

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Dennis Hong regarding various topics and the following File Nos.

File No. 211232 - Administrative Code - Housing Innovation Program

File No. 220631 - Charter Amendment, Initiative Ordinance, and Policy Declaration - Affordable Housing Production Act

File No. 220636 - Charter Amendment and Ordinance - Additional Density and Height; Rent-Control

File No. 220690 - Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 Expenditure Plan

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Dennis Hong <dennisjames888@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>; George, Sherie (CPC) <sherie.george@sfgov.org>; Foster, Nicholas (CPC) <nicholas.foster@sfgov.org>
Subject: We need your help

Dear Honorable members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and everyone. Last night I was able to see what was on your agenda for July 19, 2022. I trust you are all doing well and that my email here makes it in time for your 7/19/2022 meeting. But as always they are just some of my rambling notes I had on my 2do list. But we need your help. So lets get started.

Most of this is below is a copy and paste from your 7/19/2022 Agenda:

Please support the following, its good business:

46. 211232 [Administrative Code - Housing Innovation Program] Sponsors: Melgar; Mar and Mandelman Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Housing Innovation Program to develop, finance, and support certain additional housing opportunities for low-income and moderate-income residents, including loans and technical assistance for certain low-income and moderate-income property owners to construct accessory dwelling units or other new units on their property, subject to certain conditions, loans for certain low-income and moderate-income tenants who are at risk of displacement and licensed childcare providers, and grants for organizations to create marketing and educational materials about wealth-building and homeownership for residents who have been historically disadvantaged and to develop creative construction design prototypes for low-income and moderate-income residents. Question: Shall this Ordinance be PASSED ON FIRST READING?

57. 220631 [Charter Amendment, Initiative Ordinance, and Policy Declaration - Affordable Housing Production Act] Sponsors: Chan; Walton, Peskin, Preston, Ronen and Mar Charter Amendment (Fourth Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to provide for accelerated review and approval of eligible 100% affordable housing projects, educator housing projects, and market-rate projects that provide significant increased affordability, and providing for Planning Department ministerial review in lieu of approvals by or certain appeals to City boards and commissions; to make corresponding amendments to the Planning Code and the Business and Tax Regulations Code; to amend the Administrative Code to provide for an Annual Affordable Housing Allocation Report as part of the City's budge

63. 220636 [Charter Amendment and Ordinance - Additional Density and Height; Rent-Control] Sponsors: Peskin; Chan, Preston and Walton Charter Amendment (Third Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to set forth a requirement that when the City amends the Planning Code to allow for additional residential numerical density or height, that developers agree to subject the new residential units in the development, other than Affordable Housing Units, to rent control; to amend the Administrative Code to establish as the residential numerical density and height limits those controls in effect as of November 8, 2022, and to allow the Board of Supervisors to amend the Planning Code to exceed those limits if the ordinance requires a regulatory agreement to subject all dwelling units in development projects, other than Affordable Housing Units, to rent control; to

from your 7/12/2022 mtg:

What is the scope of work covered in the fund and accountability/s?

220690 Sponsor: Mayor Resolution approving the Fiscal Years (FYs) 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 Expenditure Plan for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive

Housing Fund. Supervisor Walton, seconded by Supervisor Melgar, moved that this Resolution be CONTINUED to the Board of Supervisors meeting of July 19, 2022. The motion carried by the following vote: Ayes: 11 - Chan, Dorsey, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton

My Current issues:

One Oak Project: I mention to the SF Planning Commissioners on 7/14/200 in support of the One Oak project:

a. I have been in support of this since mid 2017 and still do.
b. Because of both recent articles in the SF Business times, the SF Chronicle and the YIMBY, including several other reports. It was confusing as to what's next. If and When it comes up on your agenda again, please keep in mind its a wonderful housing project that we all need and I hope you will all support it. I do not know much about all the CA SB's and AB's, etc. referencing these all too many complicated Housing rules/legislation, etc but I do know, we need all the housing we can get and because as I understand it doing nothing here may cause some heavy fines. Please understand these items when voting with the housing issues. They are great tools in your box to use.

c. In my opinion, the current population explosion that needs all the housing is not really our fault. But some how it needs our support.
d. But the One Oak seems to have part of this nailed, its apartments and not (really) housing pe/se. Its a two way issue.

e. Please continue to support all the CA, fed etc. housing mandates, etc. or suffer the recoil/s.

f. We need your support with the SF Plannings DEIR - Housing Element 2022 when it comes
to you for your approval, case no 2019-016230CWP, think there was another case no. to this original one.
g. As requested, I have had a chance to chime in on the DEIR (both volumes I and II (2022) and to send in my comments, which I did, you were cc'd on my email of June 9, 2022. The DEIR was another professional spot on Document.

Several other interesting issues – my opinion:

a. Fining, penalizing, taxing property owners on vacant houses, store fronts, housing is not a way to go, but be fixable. Why blames the property owners? Business' are having a hard time justifying doing business in SF, including living in the city.
b. Now I hear that there is even the possibility of expediting these business, permit process may not be passed and it may be part of the Nov ballot (TBD). If that were the case that is a real shame. That is a key part of this process that is needed for the SBA folks. These folks really need help with this process. As it is now it is to hard to navigate the current process. They are not really tech savvy. Hold their hand.

c. Thanks for the legislation on the Mental Health program. I have not read it fully yet, but it was long over due and in my opinion is the part of the root cause of homeless.

d. What ever happened to that wonderful SF Homeless Connect program that our former Mayor Gavin Newsom started? It was a good program. Well it looks like it has lost some steam. Why keep reinventing the wheel?

Dennis is a native of San Francisco, (seventy five+ years). Property owner in District 7. Worked in the city for fifty+ years. Had many years in District 3.

In closing, thanks to all for reading my rambling emails. Sorry for my redundant comments. My current system and access to the internet has been weak at best, with even all the large pdf/down loads. Would really like it if anyone could respond here with your thoughts good or bad.

Lets see who will be the first to respond to me. Too be continued.

All the best
BXXSafe

Dennis is at dennisjames888@yahoo.com.