

Carroll, John (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 9:56 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 151015, 151054, 150873, 150790 FW: 75 Howard // 5M Project // Transit

Categories: 151015, 150790, 150873, 151054

From: Aaron Goodman [mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lee, Mayor (MYR) <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>
Subject: 75 Howard // 5M Project // Transit

SF Board of Supervisors

I am unable to attend Tuesday's hearing of the SFBOS but want to submit comments on the following items.

Item 29 - 151015 - 75 Howard - I am in support of the appellants due to concerns of the height and shadow issues in relation to this project. I support Mr. Osgood's raised issues and that of the community opposed to the current project as proposed.

Item 15 - 151054 - 5M Project - I support the appellants SOMCAN and their concerns raised on the fundamental right to a fair hearing involving unbiased decision makers. The Board of Supervisors is the ultimate decision making body in this matter. Accordingly, each Board of Supervisor must protect the parties' due process rights, including barring private communications with any party behind closed doors, pursuant to San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Adm. Code Ch. 67). By, privately meeting with the developer to negotiate a non-public deal and by expressing her support for the revised Project, Supervisor Kim cannot fairly consider the merits of the appeal and her actions have negatively prejudiced the appeal process. Citizens now pose the following question. Were any other Supervisors involved in the privately negotiated deal with the developers? Citizens also request a 60-day continuance to resolve this question. This is again similar to issues of negotiating behind closed doors which occurred prior on the Parkmerced project, and based on the last electorate vote the issues of lobbyists garnering deals and decisions behind closed doors is not acceptable to the general public. This project does not provide essential needed rental housing affordable to the existing community being displaced by gentrification and increased housing costs in this district. The 5M project should be required to provide ON-SITE housing and at a min. 50% of that housing should be affordable and rental housing essential to the working component of the project proposed. This project does little to solve the housing concerns which is outlined in the SF Examiner "In My View" article by Dyan Ruiz a member of the SoMa Action Committee SMAC concerned with displacement in the SoMa area, which I support as an appeal to the projects "zero affordable housing" proposal. This sends the wrong message about what we need for future housing concerns in SF.

Item #3 - 150873 - Subway Masterplan - I am opposed to the proposed Subway Masterplan, due to the lacking conviction and ability to tax adequately development, and adequate review of above-ground options for less costly transit improvement as the priority in SF. My concerns have been submitted prior about the need to look seriously at lower cost solutions that link and loop systems vs. digging up half of san Francisco for a transit solution as proposed by Scott Wiener. We have enough financial issues with the Central Subway and the incomplete DSX connection for the HSR to downtown. The further push to extend the subway to the fisherman's wharf area ignores transit needs in surrounding outlying districts and more cost-effective above

ground light-rail transit solutions that can be built to solve essential issues in the flexibility of our systems. Transit should be an enjoyable endeavor, not just placed "under-ground"... By looking seriously at a full fledged BRT on Van Ness to the Excelsior, and Light-Rail systems on Sunset Blvd, and Geneva Harney to the new proposed Intermodal Caltrains Facility, there are better solutions to expend the tax money of the city on with even the Sloat Blvd. extension of the L line as a perfect example of short-range projects that can solve real transit issues like the Stern Grove Music Festival. Transit needs on 19th Ave. were ignored when impacts of Parkmerced, SFSU-CSU and STonestowns future growth were discussed in the 19th Ave Transit Plan, and still do not resolve major cost inhibitors, like the 1952 interchange, allemany flyover, and I-280 interchange to daly city bart... This requires independent planning and not dusting off old project folios!

Item #5 - 150790 - Transit Tax Ammendment (Hospitals) - I support increased taxes, but this measure does not do enough, and the entire package should be revisited as it ignores still the issues of Item #3 150873 and the overall costs of transit that should be bourne by large development and institutional growth. It increases minimally the taxes needed, and should be coupled with a more robust taxation for transit impact fees for housing and big business increases in SF.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Aaron Goodman D11 Resident