

FILE NO: 181021

Petitions and Communications received from October 5, 2018, through October 15, 2018, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on October 23, 2018.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information will not be redacted.

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), making the following reappointment: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

**Peter Stern** - Airport Commission – term ending August 31, 2022

From the Department of Elections, submitting the Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District No. 2 (Hoedown Yard) elector certification. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Youth Commission, submitting responses to hearings discussing Police Departments and San Francisco Unified School District's current protocols and policies where students are questioned and arrested at their school site, juvenile justice system and strategies, and updates from the Work Group to Re-Envision the jail project report outcomes. File Nos. 180901, 180922, and 180923. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From West Area California Public Utilities Commission, submitting CPUC Notification regarding Verizon Wireless PacHeights SF PAC019 and San Francisco-Oakland, CA, and SF UM002d San Francisco-Oakland, CA. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Bay Area Air Quality Manament District, Council of Community Housing Organizations and concerned citizens, regarding the proposed project at 700 Innes Avenue and Indian Basin Shoreline Park. 4 letters. File No. 180841. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From Henry Karnilowicz, President of the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Association, regarding the appointment of Jessica Cabrera to the Graffiti Advisory Board. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From B. Edwards, regarding the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From concerned citizens, regarding transit only lanes. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Christopher Richard, regarding the restoration of fresh water in the Tuolumne River to San Francisco Bay. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From a concerned citizen, regarding Junipero Serra Park. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Jordan Davis, regarding the proposed Inclusionary Housing legislation. File No. 180911. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. 554-5184  
Fax No. 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

---

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

Date: October 9, 2018  
To: Members, Board of Supervisors  
From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Subject: Reappointment by the Mayor

---

The Mayor has submitted the following reappointment which is effective immediately unless the Board rejects by a two-thirds vote as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

- **Peter Stern** - Airport Commission - term ending August 31, 2022

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral reappointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the reappointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the reappointment and reject, within 30 days (November 8, 2018) following the transmittal of the Mayor's reappointment.

If you are interested in requesting a hearing, please notify me in writing by **5:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 17, 2018.**

(Attachments)

c: Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy  
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney  
Kanishka Cheng - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED  
MAYOR

**Notice of Nomination for Reappointment**

October 5, 2018

*Received  
by Kevin  
Peggy  
10-9-18*

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to section §3.100(18), of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

**Peter Stern**, for reappointment to the San Francisco Airport Commission to serve a four year term ending August 31, 2022.

I am confident that Mr. Stern will continue to serve our community well. Attached are his qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how his reappointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this reappointment nomination.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed  
Mayor



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
**DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS**

John Arntz, Director

October 9, 2018

Honorable Members  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, California 94102

BOS-11  
C pages  
File Nos.  
180792  
180783  
180784

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2018 OCT -9 AM 8:30  
AK

Re: Registered Voters within Boundaries of Proposed "City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District No. 2 (Hoedown Yard)"

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

This letter confirms that on September 25, 2018, I have reviewed the records of registered voters for the territory that is encompassed within the boundary of the City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District No. 2 (Hoedown Yard) (the "IRFD"), as such territory is shown on the boundary map for IRFD, reference to which map is hereby made and by this reference incorporated herein.

Based on this review, I hereby certify that on the aforementioned date, there was one registered voter within the boundary of the IRFD.

Respectfully,

John Arntz, Director

Youth Commission  
City Hall ~ Room 345  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4532



(415) 554-6446  
(415) 554-6140 FAX  
www.sfgov.org/youth\_commission

BOS-11  
File Nos. 180901, 180922 and  
180923  
3 letters

**YOUTH COMMISSION**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** John Carroll, Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee  
**FROM:** Youth Commission  
**DATE:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018  
**RE:** Referral response to BOS File No. 180901 – [Hearing on the Police Department's and San Francisco Unified School District's current protocols and policies where students are questioned and arrested at their school site, as well as when they are in police custody, particularly relating to parental noticing, student privacy, and school safety; and requesting the Police Department and San Francisco Unified School District to report]

---

At our **Monday, October 15, 2018, meeting**, the Youth Commission voted unanimously to support the following motion:

**To support BOS File No. 180901** – [Hearing on the Police Department's and San Francisco Unified School District's current protocols and policies where students are questioned and arrested at their school site, as well as when they are in police custody, particularly relating to parental noticing, student privacy, and school safety; and requesting the Police Department and San Francisco Unified School District to report]

\*\*\*

Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to this issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Bahlam Vigil".

---

Bahlam Vigil, Chair  
Adopted on October 15, 2018  
2018-2019 San Francisco Youth Commission

Youth Commission  
City Hall ~ Room 345  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4532



(415) 554-6446  
(415) 554-6140 FAX  
www.sfgov.org/youth\_commission

## YOUTH COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

**TO:** John Carroll, Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee  
**FROM:** Youth Commission  
**DATE:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018  
**RE:** Referral response to BOS File No. 180922 – [Hearing on the juvenile justice system and strategies, including Juvenile Hall and the closure of Log Cabin Ranch, as well as community-based alternatives to detention; and requesting the Juvenile Probation Department to report]

---

At our **Monday, October 15, 2018, meeting**, the Youth Commission voted unanimously to support the following motion:

**To support BOS File No. 180922** – [Hearing on the juvenile justice system and strategies, including Juvenile Hall and the closure of Log Cabin Ranch, as well as community-based alternatives to detention; and requesting the Juvenile Probation Department to report].

Commissioners also approved the following comments and recommendations regarding this legislation:

- 1) Conversations should be conducted with youth who went absent without leave from Log Cabin Ranch to understand the underlying reasons of why they would unexpectedly depart.
- 2) With the intended commitment to create a Task Force to identify best practices for alternatives to detention, that youth seats be made available on said Task Force to better represent youth voices and experience.
- 3) A youth member of the public stated that the amount of money that goes towards Log Cabin Ranch is a large waste of tax payer’s money and could be better used for different services impacting the city.

\*\*\*

Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to this issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bahlam Vigil".

---

Bahlam Vigil, Chair  
Adopted on October 15, 2018  
2018-2019 San Francisco Youth Commission

Youth Commission  
City Hall ~ Room 345  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4532



(415) 554-6446  
(415) 554-6140 FAX  
www.sfgov.org/youth\_commission

**YOUTH COMMISSION**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** John Carroll, Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee  
**FROM:** Youth Commission  
**DATE:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018  
**RE:** Referral response to BOS File No. 180923 – [Hearing to discuss updates from the Work Group to Re-Envision the Jail Project Report Outcomes; and requesting the Sherriff’s Department, the Department of Public Health, and the San Francisco Taxpayers for Public Safety to report]

---

At our **Monday, October 15, 2018, meeting**, the Youth Commission voted unanimously to support the following motion:

**To support BOS File No. 180923** – [Hearing to discuss updates from the Work Group to Re-Envision the Jail Project Report Outcomes; and requesting the Sherriff’s Department, the Department of Public Health, and the San Francisco Taxpayers for Public Safety to report]

\*\*\*

Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to this issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Bahlam Vigil".

---

Bahlam Vigil, Chair  
Adopted on October 15, 2018  
2018-2019 San Francisco Youth Commission



**From:** [West Area CPUC](#)  
**To:** [CPC.Wireless](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov); [West Area CPUC](#)  
**Subject:** CPUC Notification - Verizon Wireless - PacHeights SF PAC019  
**Date:** Sunday, October 14, 2018 7:51:24 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC Notification - Verizon Wireless - PacHeights SF PAC019.pdf](#)

---

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC"). This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.

If you prefer to receive these notices by US Mail, please reply to this email stating your jurisdiction's preference.

Thank you



October 13, 2018

Ms. Anna Hom  
Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
[GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)

RE: Notification Letter for PacHeights SF PAC019  
San Francisco-Oakland, CA / GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership / U-3002-C

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Sincerely,

Melinda Salem  
Engr IV Spec-RE/Regulatory  
15505 Sand Canyon Avenue, Irvine, CA 92618  
[WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com](mailto:WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com)



## CPUC Attachment A

Initial Build (new presence for Verizon Wireless)

VZW LEGAL ENTITY	JURISDICTION	PLANNING DIRECTOR	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	CLERK OF THE BOARD	COUNTY
GTE Mobilnet of CA Limited Partnership	City of San Francisco 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl San Francisco, CA 94102	<a href="mailto:cpc.wireless@sfgov.org">cpc.wireless@sfgov.org</a>	<a href="mailto:city.administrator@sfgov.org">city.administrator@sfgov.org</a>	<a href="mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org">Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org</a>	San Francisco

Site Name	Site Address	Site APN	Site Coordinates (NAD 83)	Project Description	Number & type of Antennas	Tower Design	Tower Appearance	Tower Height (in feet)	Size of Building or NA	Type of Approval	Approval Issue Date	Approval Effective Date	Approval Permit Number	Resolution Number
PacHeights SF PAC019	near 3201 Jackson Street San Francisco, CA 94118	N/A - public right-of-way	37° 47' 26.72" N 122° 26' 51.45" W	Installation and operation of an antenna and associated equipment on an existing anchor pole in the public right-of-way.	1 Amphenol WB080X06F x60 Antenna	Steel Light Pole	Antenna RAD of 26'-3"	27'-3"	N/A	Wireless Box Permit	11/28/17	11/28/17	16WR-0116	N/A

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CPUC Notification - Verizon Wireless - SF UM200d  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 11:00:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC Notification - Verizon Wireless - SF UM 002d.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** West Area CPUC <WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2018 2:15 PM  
**To:** CPC.Wireless <CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org>; Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov; West Area CPUC <WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com>  
**Subject:** CPUC Notification - Verizon Wireless - SF UM200d

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC"). This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.

If you prefer to receive these notices by US Mail, please reply to this email stating your jurisdiction's preference.

Thank you



October 11, 2018

Ms. Anna Hom  
Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
[GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)

RE: Notification Letter for SF UM 002d  
San Francisco-Oakland, CA / GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership / U-3002-C

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Sincerely,

Melinda Salem  
Engr IV Spec-RE/Regulatory  
15505 Sand Canyon Avenue, Irvine, CA 92618  
[WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com](mailto:WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com)



## CPUC Attachment A

Initial Build (new presence for Verizon Wireless)

VZW LEGAL ENTITY	JURISDICTION	PLANNING DIRECTOR	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	CLERK OF THE BOARD	COUNTY
GTE Mobilnet of CA Limited Partnership	City of San Francisco 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl San Francisco, CA 94102	<a href="mailto:cpc.wireless@sfgov.org">cpc.wireless@sfgov.org</a>	<a href="mailto:city.administrator@sfgov.org">city.administrator@sfgov.org</a>	<a href="mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org">Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org</a>	San Francisco

Site Name	Site Address	Site APN	Site Coordinates (NAD 83)	Project Description	Number & type of Antennas	Tower Design	Tower Appearance	Tower Height (in feet)	Size of Building or NA	Type of Approval	Approval Issue Date	Approval Effective Date	Approval Permit Number	Resolution Number
UM 002d	1836 Stockton St. San Francisco, CA 94133	N/A - public right-of-way	37° 48' 10.05" N 122° 24' 34.57" W	Installation of one 7.9" diameter x 23.5" tall canister antenna, two 16.5" x 9.8" x 5.7" mRRU's on to an existing (29' 9") SFPUC concrete streetlight pole.	1 canister antenna	SFPUC concrete pole	Canister antenna @ 32' 2" RAD	33'-5" AGL	N/A	Personal Wireless Service Facility Permit	9/18/18	10/4/18	18WR-0054	N/A



**BAY AREA  
AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT  
DISTRICT**

**ALAMEDA COUNTY**  
John J. Bauters  
Pauline Russo Cutter  
Scott Haggerty  
Nate Miley

**CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**  
John Gioia  
David Hudson  
(Chair)  
Karen Mitchoff  
Mark Ross

**MARIN COUNTY**  
Katie Rice  
(Vice Chair)

**NAPA COUNTY**  
Brad Wagenknecht

**SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY**  
Rafael Mandelman  
Hillary Ronen  
Tyrone Jue  
(SF Mayor's Appointee)

**SAN MATEO COUNTY**  
David Canepa  
Carole Groom  
Doug Kim

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY**  
Margaret Abe-Koga  
Cindy Chavez  
Liz Kniss  
Rod G. Sinks  
(Secretary)

**SOLANO COUNTY**  
Pete Sanchez  
James Spering

**SONOMA COUNTY**  
Teresa Barrett  
Shirlee Zane

Jack P. Broadbent  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER/APCO

Connect with the  
Bay Area Air District:



**4 letters**

October 10, 2018

*File 18084*

*BOS-11, Leg Aides  
Leg Dep., Page*

Malia Cohen, President of the Board of Supervisors  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Air District comments at October 2, 2018 Board Hearing regarding the India Basin Mixed-Use Project EIR Appeal

Dear Ms. Cohen and Ms. Calvillo

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) staff made public comments at the October 2, 2018 Board Hearing regarding the India Basin EIR Appeal. These comments were regarding the Project's air quality mitigation measures to minimize exposure to fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) from the Project's construction and operation activities. PM<sub>2.5</sub> is by far the most harmful air pollutant in the Air District's jurisdiction in terms of public health. Scientific evidence indicates that both long-term and short-term exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> can cause a wide range of health effects, such as aggravating asthma, bronchitis, respiratory and cardio-vascular symptoms, and contributing to heart attacks and death.

Bayview-Hunters Point and other parts of eastern San Francisco experience higher PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels than much of the region. The combination of higher pollution levels and a community particularly vulnerable to air pollution led the Air District to highlight eastern San Francisco as an impacted community through our Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program and, more recently, through our Community Health Protection Program we are developing in response to AB 617.

In the spirit of protecting public health and in response to the October 10<sup>th</sup> memo from Lisa Gibson to Angela Calvillo regarding Appeal of the Certification of the Project EIR, we would like to elaborate and clarify on the October 2, 2018 comments as follows:

**The Project's analysis and mitigation measures are sufficient**

Since the October 2, 2018 Board Hearing, Air District staff has reviewed City staff's responses intended to identify feasible mitigation measures in response to Air District comments at the Board Hearing. Air District staff greatly appreciates City staff's responsiveness to our concerns. Air District staff agrees that the Project's analysis of and mitigation measures for PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are sufficient. The Project's PM<sub>2.5</sub> analysis adheres to recommended Air District methods. Where the Project's analysis diverges from Air District methods, the methods are more stringent and, thus, more health protective. These more stringent methods rely on the City's Community Risk Reduction Plan and Project-specific emissions analysis. In sum, the result is a rigorous and highly health-protective analysis of both background and Project-specific emissions.

**Air District supports mixed-use and infill projects**

The Air District has long recognized the importance of mixed-use and infill projects, such as this Project, to help the Bay Area reach its air quality goals. Mixed-use and infill projects that provide jobs and housing in urban areas with excellent access to transit and short distances between residential, employment, retail, and recreational uses help to reduce transportation emissions. Transportation emissions include criteria air pollutants (including PM<sub>2.5</sub>), greenhouse gas emissions, and diesel particulate matter and other toxic air contaminants. For more information about the Air District's work to support mixed-use and infill development while protecting public health, please see the guidebook [Planning Healthy Places](#) (2016) and the 2017 Clean Air Plan: [Spare the Air, Cool the Climate](#).

**The Air District and City staff have an excellent partnership**

As stated at the October 2, 2018 Board Hearing, the City has been a great partner to the Air District. In addition to adopting a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, the City is the only jurisdiction within the Air District to implement rigorous health protective policies within the rubric of a citywide Community Risk Reduction Plan to reduce the health impacts of air pollution citywide (and particularly for vulnerable populations). The City's risk reduction efforts to require new residential construction projects located in the City's Air Pollution Exposure Zones to install enhanced ventilation to protect residents from air pollution, the City has also adopted a Construction Dust Control Ordinance and the Clean Construction Ordinance. Air District staff greatly appreciates San Francisco's commitment to reducing air pollution emissions and exposure. City staff's response to Air District's concerns the week of October 1, 2018 about the Project is just another example of staff's responsiveness and flexibility.

Air District staff approaches this collaboration as technical experts on air pollution and climate issues. We do not make land use decisions; that is the appropriate role for City staff and decision makers. We are committed to continue to work with you to assure that air quality, health, and climate impacts are analyzed correctly and minimized to the greatest extent possible.

In sum, Air District staff greatly appreciates the opportunity to work with the City to address air quality impacts on this Project and others. We look forward to a meeting with City staff soon to discuss ways the Air District and City can work to improve our air quality consultation process. If you have any further questions about the Air District's review of this Project, please contact Alison Kirk, Senior Planner, at (415) 749-5169 or [akirk@baaqmd.gov](mailto:akirk@baaqmd.gov).

Sincerely,



Greg Nudd  
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

Cc: BAAQMD Director Tyrone Jue  
BAAQMD Director Rafael Mandelman  
BAAQMD Director Hillary Ronen  
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer



**From:** [Council of Community Housing Organizations](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** India Basin Housing Plan - Comments  
**Date:** Monday, October 15, 2018 8:07:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [CCHO Comments - India Basin Housing Plan.doc](#)

---

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

Supervisors,

Attached and copied below, please find our written comments regarding the India Basin Housing Plan.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Fernando Martí and Peter Cohen

**Council of Community Housing Organizations**  
**CCHO Action**

*Celebrating 40 years as the voice of San Francisco's affordable housing movement*  
325 Clementina Street, San Francisco 94103  
415-882-0901 office  
[www.sfccho.org](http://www.sfccho.org)

October 15, 2018

Re: India Basin Development Agreement “Housing Plan”

Supervisors,

The Council of Community Housing Organizations does not have a formal position supporting or opposing the India Basin development project, but we do wish to provide some comments for your consideration regarding the proposed Housing Plan for the project.

Exhibit H of the Development Agreement proposes 1,575 total units, with 25% of all residential units built within the project site as inclusionary units, affordable units on their own sites, or a portion of this requirement may be met through in lieu fees. If provided onsite, that's 394 affordable units.

As always with affordability deals, the devilish details are important to review closely. There are three primary issues we flag for your consideration: 1.) on-site housing affordability levels are inconsistent with the City's Inclusionary housing standards, 2.) no obligation to provide development sites for 100% affordable housing, 3.) effective net *reduction* in the 25% affordability through allowed in lieu fee option.

Affordability levels inconsistent with the City's inclusionary housing standards.

The affordable housing plan only requires that the total of all units meet an average of 110% AMI for rentals and 120% AMI for condos. There is no obligation to have even a single low-

income unit (below 80%AMI) on site. By contrast, the Citywide Inclusionary Housing standard has three tiers of units – 55%AMI; 80%AMI; 110%AMI—with the average across the entire Inclusionary requirement being 75%AMI. Ownership inclusionary units also have three tiers at 80%AMI; 105%AMI; 130%AMI—not a single fixed average for all units. The proposed India Basin deal is a significantly different, higher-income inclusionary housing standard than what developments across the rest of the City are required to provide to meet a range of household income needs. If provided as inclusionary onsite, it would thus make sense that the India Basin units should follow the citywide Inclusionary Housing rules as described in Sec 415, in order to meet a range of incomes. Otherwise, as currently written, ALL affordable units could be provided at 110% or 120% AMI. For comparison, according to the MOHCD 2018 AMI table, the “affordable” price at those levels would be targeted to individuals earning between \$91,000 and \$100,000.

No obligation to provide development sites for affordable housing.

The affordable housing plan has no obligation to provide a site to the city for nonprofit development, just an option (instead of some of the inclusionary units) for ‘up to three’ sites at the developer’s discretion (Exhibit H, Page 7). To create a diverse balance of affordability, it would make sense that the plan include a clear requirement for three dedicated sites, with an RFP process to select community based nonprofit developers for these sites with local engagement and experience.

Effective net *Reduction* in affordability through allowed in lieu fee option.

The affordable housing plan allows a portion of the 25% affordable requirement to be fulfilled through in-lieu fee payments (Exhibit H, page 10), generating fees for up to 75 offsite affordable units that can be satisfied through either new construction or acquisition rehabilitation exclusively in Supervisor District 10. While options to provide funding in the broader District 10 are a good goal, the method of calculating this does not maintain equivalency with the value of the on-site Inclusionary units. By allowing an INCREASE in on-site market-rate housing, the fee-out actually results in a net *reduction* of affordability and a cost reduction to the developer. In order to maintain the total 25% affordable obligation, the in-lieu payment would need to be sufficient funding for 100 offsite units. Moreover, the fee methodology should not undercut the citywide fee calculation, which as you know is currently at 30% for rentals and 33% for condos. Following is our calculation:

- o Onsite option: (394 affordable) / 1575 total = 25%
- o On/Offsite option: (319 onsite + **100 offsite**) / 1675 total = 25%

As an alternative, the following changes to the India Basin Development Agreement’s Housing Plan could better meet the concerns laid out above, and would serve a full range of affordable housing needs by income and household size.

1. The Housing Plan could require that any onsite inclusionary units meet either the three tiers and overall average AMI specified in the citywide Inclusionary policy, or, if an “averaging” approach is preferred, the following scale:
  - a. For studios and 1-BR units, an average AMI up to 80% AMI, with units spread evenly in a range from 60% AMI to 100% AMI.
  - b. For 2-BR and larger units, an average AMI up to 100% AMI, with units spread evenly in a range from 60% AMI to 140% AMI.
  - c. A minimum of 40% of inclusionary units to be 2-BR or larger, with 10%

3-BR or larger.

2. The Housing Plan could specify that sites for 100% affordable housing, with minimum site capacity for 200 units, shall be dedicated to the City as development-ready pads, to be issued as RFQs/RFPs by MOHCD to a community based nonprofit affordable housing developer with local experience and community engagement. These units would serve income levels up to 60% AMI.

3. The Housing Plan could specify equivalency between onsite and in lieu fee obligations, by requiring that any reduction in onsite units through in lieu fees should result in funding for an equivalent of 1.33 offsite units, using the same fee scale as required for projects citywide.

Sincerely,

Fernando Martí and Peter Cohen

Co-directors, Council of Community Housing Organizations

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors; Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: India Basin Project Support  
**Date:** Monday, October 15, 2018 8:30:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [India Basin Support.docx](#)

---

**From:** Sean Karlin [<mailto:sean.karlin@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2018 6:28 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Malia (BOS) <[malia.cohen@sfgov.org](mailto:malia.cohen@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; IBNA board <[ibnabod@googlegroups.com](mailto:ibnabod@googlegroups.com)>; Victoria Lehman <[victoria@bldsf.com](mailto:victoria@bldsf.com)>  
**Subject:** India Basin Project Support

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have written a letter of support for the India Basin mixed-use development project.  
In case I cannot make the Tuesday meeting in person, I did want my support for Build Inc's proposed project know to the board.  
My letter is attached.

Thank you,  
Sean D. Karlin  
415.265.8691 m.

**Jill Fox**

911 Innes Avenue San Francisco, CA 94124 · (415) 420-9887 · ibjill@comcast.net

BOS-11

October 12, 2018

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

RE: Files: 180841, 180680, 180816

2018 OCT 15 PM 4:43

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
c/o Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102



Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of the India Basin project. My earlier correspondence was as the Chair of the India Basin Neighborhood Association (IBNA). These comments are my personal opinions. I have lived on Innes Avenue for 26 years in a home continuously occupied as a residence since 1874.

Our neighborhood is beautiful but challenged – there is no food, there are no amenities, our infrastructure is weak – the telephone poles along Innes Avenue were installed in 1941 and are the oldest in the city – and we lack basic services. City department representatives have told us repeatedly that the improvements we need can only come with more people living here. I've advocated for India Basin Shoreline Park and the 900 Innes park site for decades and we need this approval to move forward on the park, Bay Trail, and Blue Greenway that will serve our entire region. I want to live in a neighborhood with amenities and services like every other San Franciscan. Please vote **YES** to move this project forward.

Please consider my suggestions for lessening the environmental impact AND increasing affordable housing numbers:

1. **Help us get interim improvements ASAP:** For example, encourage city departments to fast track interim safety improvements such as cross walks, bus shelters, and safety banners to make the neighborhood more livable during construction; get RPD and DPW to install the Hudson Avenue Class One Bike Path because the sooner we have a safe bike path the more likely people (residents and construction workers) will bike rather than drive in and out of our community; encourage a food provider to locate in the neighborhood because the sooner there is food nearby, the sooner people will shop local rather than drive in and out for groceries.
2. **Insist on reasonable construction work hours:** If construction is only Monday – Friday from 7 to 4, there will be less impact on the Banya business and on residents just trying to enjoy time at home.
3. **Think comprehensively to create a balanced neighborhood:** India Basin already includes hundreds of units of very affordable housing at the Hunters View, Westbrook, and Hunters Point public housing sites, which ring our neighborhood. Our neighborhood – and our city – need to house the missing middle. The range of housing affordability provided in the India Basin project, along with the promised recreation, commercial, and civic spaces, will balance our neighborhood economically and provide opportunities for people to socialize together.
4. **There is gold in the hills:** If you really want more affordable housing in the neighborhood, look up the hill to the land of the Westbrook Public Housing site, now managed by the John Stewart Company. There are acres of under-utilized land just above India Basin, perfect for additional affordable housing.
5. **Better utilize 1550 Evans:** You could include affordable housing and the major food market on the PUC-owned 1550 Evans site, which can accommodate housing, a market, AND the planned community center. Note I said AND. In my opinion, the PUC "outreach" was designed to pit members of the community against each other by saying a replacement community center OR housing. With housing, groceries, and a community center, the 1550 Evans site will do much to fill the needs of the broader community. It is also PRACTICAL to have housing and a market and a community center at that central intersection, which is well served by public transit.

I have a long resume of volunteer efforts to help make my neighborhood more livable including advocating for the 900 Innes landmarking and acquisition, six years on the Hunters Point Shipyard Restoration Advisory Committee, five years as the D10 representative on PROSAC, service on the original Blue Greenway Task Force, writing the Community Vision that was used as an inspiration for the Build Inc. plan, and involvement in the India Basin Parks and Trails Task Force.

I only want what is best for my neighborhood. I hope you do, too. Thank you for your consideration,

  
Jill Fox

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa \(BOS\); Young, Victor](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Jessica Cabrera FOR Mayor's Appointed Seat on Graffiti Advisory Board  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 10:55:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Cabrera Support Letter.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Henry Karnilowicz <occexp@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 05, 2018 9:51 PM  
**To:** Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (MYR) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; jcabrera@elitepropertiessf.com  
**Subject:** Jessica Cabrera FOR Mayor's Appointed Seat on Graffiti Advisory Board

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

Dear Mr. Mawuli,

Attached is a letter in support of the appointing of Ms. Jessica Cabrera to the Graffiti Advisory Board.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

[Henry Karnilowicz](#)  
President  
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

2443 Fillmore Street #189  
San Francisco, CA 94115  
415.420.8113 cell  
415.621.7583 fax



# San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

Henry Karnilowicz  
President

Albert Chow  
Vice President

Yuka Ioroi  
Secretary

Keith Goldstein  
Treasurer

Vas Kiniris  
Executive Administrator

## SFCDMA

### MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

- Arab American Grocers Association
- Balboa Village Merchants Association
- Bayview Merchants Association
- Castro Merchants
- Chinatown Merchants Association
- Clement St. Merchants Association
- Dogpatch Business Association
- Fillmore Merchants Association
- Fishermans Wharf Merchants Association
- Golden Gate Restaurant Association
- Glen Park Merchants Association
- Golden Gate Restaurant Association
- Greater Geary Boulevard Merchants & Property Owners Association
- Japantown Merchants Association
- Larkin Street Merchants Association
- Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors Association
- Marina Merchants Association
- Mission Creek Merchants Association
- Mission Merchants Association
- Noe Valley Merchants & Professionals Association
- North Beach Business Association
- North East Mission Business Association
- People of Parkside Sunset
- Polk District Merchants Association
- Potrero Dogpatch Merchants Association
- Sacramento Street Merchants Association
- South Beach Mission Bay Business Association
- South of Market Business Association
- The Outer Sunset Merchant & Professional Association
- Union Street Association
- Valencia Corridor Merchants Association
- West Portal Merchants Association

October 4, 2018

Mr. Mawuli Tugbenyoh  
 Legislative Director  
 Liaison to the Board of Supervisors  
 City Hall, Room 200  
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
 San Francisco, CA 94102

RE;  
 Ms. Jessica M. Cabrera  
 Appointment to the Graffiti Advisory Board.

Dear Mr. Tugbenyoh,

I am writing to you in support of the appointment of Ms. Jessica M. Cabrera to Seat 18 of the Graffiti Advisory Board.

I have known Ms. Cabrera for around five years and I have found her to be reliable, responsible, honest, understanding and fair.

As a single mother of two young daughters I have been amazed at how she has managed to be dedicated to her daughters yet also has managed to work as an independent real estate broker as well as working with the community, such as helping create CBD's.

She earned her Bachelors of Science in Criminal Justice in 2004 and an MBA in 2012.

She is a huge fan of murals which, are part of our urban fabric, however graffiti is a blight which impacts both locals and visitors to our gem of a city. This contributes to property damage and a sense of insecurity.

With both her law enforcement back ground in terms of understanding that this issue has to be handled proactively not just reactively, and her real estate background are an asset to neighborhood improvements, revitalization and value-added tenant-uses.

Sincerely,

Henry Karnilowicz  
President

October 1, 2018

Mayor Breed  
President Cohen  
Members of the Board of Supervisors  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Office of the Clerk of the Board,

I am informed by my experiences, and I would like to note such in regard to the Office of the Clerk of the Board.

Interactions with the Office of the Clerk of the Board, whether in regard to the mundane or a highly charged matter, and whether in my name as an individual, or in those of an entity accustomed to deference, appear to be equally professional.

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is seemingly unconcerned with who I know, what I own, and how well adorned my communications might be.

Given that I am neither well connected, nor wealthy, nor charming, this quality delights me to no end.

When Government works, it is because of real people whose steadfast and unheralded loyalty to the underlying ideals of their agency's mission makes it so. This--these specific people with their seemingly ingrained approach, is what yields good government. While most agencies say they conduct themselves in such a manner, and given the law of large numbers, some SLG agency somewhere likely exhibits similar dedication. Nonetheless, I am not familiar with any other so quintessential.

I cannot overstate my appreciation for the Office of the Clerk of the Board.

Sincerely,

B. Edwards  
San Francisco



**From:** [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Transit Only Lanes - Item @ SFBOS Land Use Monday Oct. 15th.  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 5:47:00 PM

---

**From:** Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2018 8:50 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com  
**Subject:** Transit Only Lanes - Item @ SFBOS Land Use Monday Oct. 15th.

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

October 14, 2018 San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco City Hall, Room 240  
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Plaza  
SF, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors:

### **TRANSIT-ONLY LANES**

I oppose opening transit-only lanes to private, for-profit buses such as tech shuttle buses, casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and other vehicles that we cannot yet imagine, without any study to show such permission won't harm MUNI and without compensation to the City for the use of a scarce public resource (city streets).

### **ACCESS TO TRANSIT-ONLY LANES IS AN ECONOMIC, TRANSIT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUE**

A system of comprehensive, affordable public transportation is part of our City's effort to combat [income inequality](#) and [climate change](#). Muni offers discount fares to seniors, the disabled, low-income people and youth. Federal law also requires Muni to serve all neighborhoods and demographics equitably -- unlike private services. Moreover, as of 2015 Muni used [less than two percent](#) of all the energy consumed in San Francisco for transportation, making expanded public transportation an ideal option for reducing the City's total carbon emissions.

Dedicated, transit-only lanes are a part of that system, and for years the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has promoted the creation of transit-only lanes as projects to improve Muni performance. In fact, the first improvement item listed as part of the [Geary Rapid Project](#) is, "Red, dedicated transit lanes to reduce unpredictable delays."

Additionally, San Francisco's population is projected to increase. Ridership on the Geary corridor alone is expected to go from the current average daily count of 54,000 to up to 99,000, according to the [Geary BRT environmental impact report](#). How will the SFMTA be able to expand its fleet of public buses to meet growing demand if its public buses are competing for dedicated lane space with private, for-profit vehicles?

Finally, the International Panel on Climate Change has issued its [most dire warning](#) yet that action to curb greenhouse gas emissions is necessary immediately. This is no time to compromise our public transit system with competition from private vehicles.

### THE LAW

State law defines a "transit bus" as a "any bus owned or operated by a publicly owned or operated transit system, or operated under contract with a publicly owned or operated transit system, and used to provide to the general public, regularly scheduled transportation for which a fare is charged." ([CVC LA.642](#)) It logically follows that "transit-only" lanes should be for "transit buses" only.

But the SFMTA attempts to mislead by making use of the more generic and less appropriate term "bus." The state vehicle code defines a bus as a vehicle "designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 10 persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group ... ." ([CVC I.B.233.b.](#)) This encompasses casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and tech shuttle buses among others.

Locally, the San Francisco City Charter reserves the right to create transportation infractions to the Board of Supervisors. [Charter Sec. 8A.102.\(b\)\(7\)\(iii\)](#) states: "Nothing in subsection 7 shall modify the power of the Board of Supervisors to establish civil offenses, infractions and misdemeanors." According to SF Transportation Code, Division I, Section 7.2 Infractions: "the actions listed in this Section [7.2](#) are prohibited, and each and every violation of a prohibition listed below shall be an infraction." The supervisors authored [Section 7.2.72](#), creating an infraction for any non-public buses and other vehicles in transit lanes. The SFMTA does not have the authority to pass contrary legislation.

Yet in recent years the SFMTA has been legislating transit-only areas to include buses ([San Francisco Transportation Code, Division II, Section 601a.22](#)) -- in contradiction to state law, our local charter, and our local transportation code. Moreover, the SFMTA has been doing this without environmental review or without explicitly stating this in environmental impact reports. In fact, the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Environmental Impact Report discusses "bus-only lanes" and "bus stops" repeatedly and only specifically mentions the impact of Geary BRT to shuttles in one section: [3.4.4.6 EFFECTS ON TAXI AND SHUTTLE OPERATIONS](#). (Caltrans defines [BRT](#) as "an innovative and cost-effective form of public transportation.")

**As a community activist concerned with the impacts daily of the shuttle bus systems on our existing transit I strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to assert its power and reaffirm that transit-only lanes are for public transit only vehicles. I have seen myself consistently improper parking, turning, and blocking of these buses, of MUNI bus and train systems. This impacts individuals who utilize mass-transit from getting to their**

**locations effectively and safely. The need to look seriously at how these bus and shuttle uses of our public infrastructure once again privatizes vs. ensuring the reliability and functional use of our existing mass-transit public systems. Please look seriously at the gaps in the system, and where to fix the MUNI system first and priority wise give MUNI the direct links needed to reconnect our systems. Sincerely, Aaron Goodman D11**

**From:** [Rosie Gozali](#)  
**To:** [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Subject:** Transit-Only Lanes  
**Date:** Saturday, October 13, 2018 6:23:56 PM

---

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

Roselle Gozali  
(415)752-3133  
October 13, 2018

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco City Hall, Room 240  
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Plaza  
SF, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors:

### **TRANSIT-ONLY LANES**

I oppose opening transit-only lanes to private, for-profit buses such as tech shuttle buses, casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and other vehicles that we cannot yet imagine, without any study to show such permission won't harm MUNI and without compensation to the City for the use of a scarce public resource (city streets).

### **ACCESS TO TRANSIT-ONLY LANES IS AN ECONOMIC, TRANSIT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUE**

A system of comprehensive, affordable public transportation is part of our City's effort to combat [income inequality](#) and [climate change](#). Muni offers discount fares to seniors, the disabled, low-income people and youth. Federal law also requires Muni to serve all neighborhoods and demographics equitably -- unlike private services. Moreover, as of 2015 Muni used [less than two percent](#) of all the energy consumed in San Francisco for transportation, making expanded public transportation an ideal option for reducing the City's total carbon emissions.

Dedicated, transit-only lanes are a part of that system, and for years the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has promoted the creation of transit-only lanes as projects to improve Muni performance. In fact, the first improvement item listed as part of the

[Geary Rapid Project](#) is, “Red, dedicated transit lanes to reduce unpredictable delays.”

Additionally, San Francisco’s population is projected to increase. Ridership on the Geary corridor alone is expected to go from the current average daily count of 54,000 to up to 99,000, according to the [Geary BRT environmental impact report](#). How will the SFMTA be able to expand its fleet of public buses to meet growing demand if its public buses are competing for dedicated lane space with private, for-profit vehicles?

Finally, the International Panel on Climate Change has issued its [most dire warning](#) yet that action to curb greenhouse gas emissions is necessary immediately. This is no time to compromise our public transit system with competition from private vehicles.

### **THE LAW**

State law defines a “transit bus” as a “any bus owned or operated by a publicly owned or operated transit system, or operated under contract with a publicly owned or operated transit system, and used to provide to the general public, regularly scheduled transportation for which a fare is charged.” ([CVC I.A.642](#)) It logically follows that “transit-only” lanes should be for “transit buses” only.

But the SFMTA attempts to mislead by making use of the more generic and less appropriate term “bus.” The state vehicle code defines a bus as a vehicle “designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 10 persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group ... .” ([CVC I.B.233.b.](#)) This encompasses casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and tech shuttle buses among others.

Locally, the San Francisco City Charter reserves the right to create transportation infractions to the Board of Supervisors. [Charter Sec. 8A.102.\(b\)\(7\)\(iii\)](#) states: “Nothing in subsection 7 shall modify the power of the Board of Supervisors to establish civil offenses, infractions and misdemeanors.” According to SF Transportation Code, Division I, Section 7.2 Infractions: “the actions listed in this Section [7.2](#) are prohibited, and each and every violation of a prohibition listed below shall be an infraction.” The supervisors authored [Section 7.2.72](#), creating an infraction for any non-public buses and other vehicles in transit lanes. The SFMTA does not have the authority to pass contrary legislation.

Yet in recent years the SFMTA has been legislating transit-only areas to include buses ([San Francisco Transportation Code, Division II, Section 601a.22](#)) -- in contradiction to state law, our local charter, and our local transportation code. Moreover, the SFMTA has been doing this without environmental review or without explicitly stating this in environmental impact reports. In fact, the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Environmental Impact Report discusses “bus-only lanes” and “bus stops” repeatedly and only specifically mentions the impact of Geary BRT to shuttles in one section: [3.4.4.6 EFFECTS ON TAXI AND SHUTTLE OPERATIONS](#).

**From:** [ss@ssteuer.com](mailto:ss@ssteuer.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Cc:** [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Tang, Katy \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Cohen, Malia \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard](#)  
**Subject:** ACCESS TO TRANSIT-ONLY LANES IS A SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUE  
**Date:** Saturday, October 13, 2018 4:09:34 PM

---

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

10-12-18

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco City Hall, Room 240  
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Plaza  
SF, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors:

### **TRANSIT-ONLY LANES**

We oppose opening transit-only lanes to private, for-profit buses such as tech shuttle buses, casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and other vehicles that we cannot yet imagine, without any study to show such permission won't harm MUNI and without compensation to the City for the use of a scarce public resource (city streets).

### **ACCESS TO TRANSIT-ONLY LANES IS AN ECONOMIC, TRANSIT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUE**

A system of comprehensive, affordable public transportation is part of our City's effort to combat [income inequality](#) and [climate change](#). Muni offers discount fares to seniors, the disabled, low-income people and youth. Federal law also requires Muni to serve all neighborhoods and demographics equitably -- unlike private services. Moreover, as of 2015 Muni used [less than two percent](#) of all the energy consumed in San Francisco for transportation, making expanded public transportation an ideal option for reducing the City's total carbon emissions.

Dedicated, transit-only lanes are a part of that system, and for years the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has promoted the creation of transit-only lanes as projects to improve Muni performance. In fact, the first improvement item listed as part of the [Geary Rapid Project](#) is, "Red, dedicated transit lanes to reduce unpredictable delays."

Additionally, San Francisco's population is projected to increase. Ridership on the Geary corridor alone is expected to go from the current average daily count of 54,000 to up to

99,000, according to the [Geary BRT environmental impact report](#). How will the SFMTA be able to expand its fleet of public buses to meet growing demand if its public buses are competing for dedicated lane space with private, for-profit vehicles?

Finally, the International Panel on Climate Change has issued its [most dire warning](#) yet that action to curb greenhouse gas emissions is necessary immediately. This is no time to compromise our public transit system with competition from private vehicles.

## **THE LAW**

State law defines a “transit bus” as a “any bus owned or operated by a publicly owned or operated transit system, or operated under contract with a publicly owned or operated transit system, and used to provide to the general public, regularly scheduled transportation for which a fare is charged.” ([CVC I.A.642](#)) It logically follows that “transit-only” lanes should be for “transit buses” only.

But the SFMTA attempts to mislead by making use of the more generic and less appropriate term "bus." The state vehicle code defines a bus as a vehicle “designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 10 persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group ... .” ([CVC I.B.233.b.](#)) This encompasses casino buses, tour buses, Chariots, and tech shuttle buses among others.

Locally, the San Francisco City Charter reserves the right to create transportation infractions to the Board of Supervisors. [Charter Sec. 8A.102.\(b\)\(7\)\(iii\)](#) states: “Nothing in subsection 7 shall modify the power of the Board of Supervisors to establish civil offenses, infractions and misdemeanors.” According to SF Transportation Code, Division I, Section 7.2 Infractions: “the actions listed in this Section [7.2](#) are prohibited, and each and every violation of a prohibition listed below shall be an infraction.” The supervisors authored [Section 7.2.72](#), creating an infraction for any non-public buses and other vehicles in transit lanes. The SFMTA does not have the authority to pass contrary legislation.

Yet in recent years the SFMTA has been legislating transit-only areas to include buses ([San Francisco Transportation Code, Division II, Section 601a.22](#)) -- in contradiction to state law, our local charter, and our local transportation code. Moreover, the SFMTA has been doing this without environmental review or without explicitly stating this in environmental impact reports. In fact, the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Environmental Impact Report discusses “bus-only lanes” and “bus stops” repeatedly and only specifically mentions the impact of Geary BRT to shuttles in one section: [3.4.4.6 EFFECTS ON TAXI AND SHUTTLE OPERATIONS](#). (Caltrans defines [BRT](#) as “an innovative and cost-effective form of public transportation.”)

[The Cultural Space Coalition](#) calls on the Board of Supervisors to assert its power and reaffirm that transit-only lanes are for public transit only vehicles.

Sincerely,

CulturalSpaceCoalition

(Contact: Sharon Steuer, [ss@ssteuer.com](mailto:ss@ssteuer.com))

CC: [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org), [Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org](mailto:Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org),  
[Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org), [Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org), [Katy.Tang@sfgov.org](mailto:Katy.Tang@sfgov.org),  
[Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org](mailto:Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org), [Jane.Kim@sfgov.org](mailto:Jane.Kim@sfgov.org), [Norman.Yee@sfgov.org](mailto:Norman.Yee@sfgov.org),  
[Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org), [Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org), [Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org](mailto:Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org),  
[Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org), [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com)



(Caltrans defines [BRT](#) as “an innovative and cost-effective form of public transportation.”)

I, Roselle Gozali, a very longtime resident of San Francisco, call on the Board of Supervisors to assert its power and reaffirm that transit-only lanes are for public transit only vehicles.

Sincerely,

Roselle Gozali

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Restore the flow of fresh water in the Tuolumne River to San Francisco Bay  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018 6:08:00 PM

---

---

**From:** Christopher Richard <christopher@creeksnoop.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018 2:35 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Restore the flow of fresh water in the Tuolumne River to San Francisco Bay

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

Dear Supervisors,

I hope the City government will help restore the flow of fresh water in the Tuolumne River to San Francisco Bay

Christopher Richard

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Maintain Junipero Serra Park  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 5:40:00 PM

---

---

**From:** timosh16@gmail.com <timosh16@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 12, 2018 1:34 PM  
**To:** Mayor London Breed (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Choy, Jarlene (BOS) <jarlene.choy@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Maintain Junipero Serra Park

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

You may have my vote on the issues you support and all I ask in return is that you see to the maintenance of Junipero Serra Park. Unfortunately, Parks and Recreation has already decided that the citizens of the Lakeside District do not deserve to have a properly maintained City park.

- Dead trees and bushes
- Field that is home to the City's Gophers (so many holes a danger to children playing ball)
- Stopped maintaining strip of grass on Stonecrest at entrance to park...a blight to the neighborhood
- Sand box has weed retarding fabric rippling through out
- Leaves and sand piling up everywhere
- Litter (due one garbage can for the whole park)
- Gate latches missing allowing kids to wander into the street
- The recently renovated club house is being rented out as a school/day care center (surely some of that income stream could be used to maintain the park)

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors: Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition To Legislation To Undermine Inclusionary Housing File 180911  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 16, 2018 5:37:00 PM

---

---

**From:** Jordan Davis <jodav1026@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2018 4:21 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Opposition To Legislation To Undermine Inclusionary Housing File 180911

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

All,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the recently introduced legislation by Mayor Breed to undermine our inclusionary housing laws.

Current law states that if certain projects were in the pipeline as late as 2016, they have until December 7, 2018 to complete the planning process in order to be included under the older (read: lower) inclusionary rates. If a project does NOT complete the process by December 7, 2018, they will be bound under the newer higher inclusionary rates, which would be 25% in some neighborhoods such as the Mission.

This legislation all but removes the December deadline, thus undermining our new inclusionary laws. This is all a sham designed to make it easier for large luxury projects that have been rightfully delayed to be built with lower inclusionary housing rates and to undermine equitable development. One of the projects that would benefit (to the detriment of the neighborhood) is the Monster In The Mission, which would accelerate gentrification in the Mission if it is built, and threaten many low income tenants in SROs and rent controlled apartments who live nearby. If the Monster gets built, it may even displace a master-leased hotel nearby that houses nearly 300 formerly homeless residents.

There is a reason why projects get delayed, and that is because they would be detrimental to the community and because there is a lot of opposition, and rightfully so.

The will of the voters of Prop C of June 2016 needs to be respected. We must reject this giveaway to developers and to vote no on 180911

-Jordan