

From: [Jim Heron](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 340 Bryant Street
Date: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 10:35:21 AM

Dear Supervisors-

My name is James Heron. I am an architect and long time San Francisco resident. I was a tenant in 340 Bryant from 1991 to 2012, and I am writing in support of the current project.

I first became aware of the Bryant Street building in the late 80's visiting an art gallery on the second floor, run by some architects in their offices. This gallery, devoted to architectural art, seemed to have found a perfect venue in this strange and wonderful structure that was shaped over time by urban forces - the bridge off ramp acting as a grand arcade wrapping the curved front facade of the building.

When I opened my own practice in 1991, I was fortunate to find space on the top floor. Initially, the building seemed mostly empty, but that changed in the mid 90's during the dot com boom. The owner made some minor interior improvements, and the spaces filled with tech businesses, graphic designers, public relations firms, photographers and artists (and a few more architects). On the ground floor were a shipping warehouse and a small retail outlet for distressed French furniture. I saw lots of businesses come and go during my 21 years in the building.

I was sad to move, but, looking back, I feel very fortunate to have had space in the building as long as I did. I feel the proposed occupancy is very appropriate to the building and to the neighborhood.

Secondly, speaking as an architect with a strong personal connection to the building, I am optimistic that the new design recognizes and preserves the special qualities that attracted me to the building, while addressing its shortcomings.

With regard to the issue of a crosswalk, the proposal to add a dedicated mid-block crosswalk across Bryant (similar to the one nearby mid-block on Second Street) seems like a good idea.

Sincerely

Jim Heron
James Heron Architect
415.543.7695

(BOS)

From: Caldeira, Rick (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 7:55 AM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: 4/7/15 Meeting Agenda item 22, Case 150171: 340 Bryant St
Categories: 150171

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Calvillo, Angela (BOS)" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Date: April 7, 2015 at 7:50:07 AM PDT
To: "Caldeira, Rick (BOS)" <rick.caldeira@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: 4/7/15 Meeting Agenda item 22, Case 150171: 340 Bryant St

For the file.
Thanks

From: Alice Rogers [<mailto:arcomnsf@pacbell.net>]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 2:34 PM
To: Kim, Jane (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Cohen, Malia (BOS); Christensen, Julie (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Avalos, John (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc: Veneracion, April (BOS); John Kevlin; Katy Liddell; Jamie Whitaker; Sue Hestor; Nicole Ferrara; Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Cristina Rubke; Henry P Rogers; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Paolo Cosulich-Schwartz
Subject: 4/7/15 Meeting Agenda item 22, Case 150171: 340 Bryant St

Honorable Supervisor Kim and other District Supervisors,

I am writing in relation to the Appeal filed on the Community Plan Exemption from CEQA Review related to 340 Bryant St. Because this is essentially a legal issue relating to regulatory standards and interpretations, I do not feel qualified to comment on whether the Appeal should be supported or denied. However, **the health and safety issues raised in the Appeal are critical and I am asking you to require action on the safest possible crossing conditions to this site prior to building occupancy**; not a single life should be lost or a body maimed due to unsafe crossing conditions to reach this building.

No one—not the project sponsor nor those of us who have lived in the neighborhood for decades—disputes that this commuter-clogged regional arterial requires safe crossing improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists transecting the traffic to reach the renovated building. There simply is no humane logic that supports allowing early-lease signers to cross at their peril, while transportation agencies are busy designing safe solutions for future tenants that all have acknowledged are critical.

Pedestrian and bike safety improvements related to this site: Please do NOT let the kind of administrative decision-making prevail that allowed installation of ADA-curb cuts to service an UNMARKED crosswalk across three-plus lanes of Bay Bridge on-ramp traffic at Stirling, as currently exists as a passageway to this site. While technically legal, such 'by-the-book' installations ignore specific site conditions and can be tragically unsafe. We don't want this scenario repeated on Bryant St.

I believe there is a broad consensus that endorses:

- An enforceable red-signal crossing, with prior pedestrian-crossing alerts positioned both east and west to maximize drivers' response, installed and maintained at sponsors' expense.
- Clear sight lines so drivers and crosswalk users can make eye-contact.
- Proper crosswalk illumination, especially as the sun is setting.
- Appropriately-sized and positioned landscaped 'barricades' that denote an entry plaza.
- Removal of the above-mentioned Stirling crossing 'opportunity'.
- Clear written warning to tenants about dangerous traffic conditions.
- Neighborhood, Vision Zero Task Force and Vision Zero Coalition participation in crossing design.

Private conversations have suggested that the sponsor may support the above, provided occupancy of their building is not slowed. The primary obstacle seems to be timing on getting improvements coordinated through all agencies, approved and installed. **If there is unity about the HIGHEST STANDARD OF SAFETY AT ALL TIMES, perhaps there are temporary mobile illuminated alerts that could be used to bridge any timing gap—provided such temporary fixtures are CERTIFIABLY AS SAFE as the final installation.**

This Appeal was critical to providing a window of opportunity to address this life safety issue, and to involving neighbors in the process. Please be sure that the Grade A crossing that has been conceptualized and identified as the responsibility of the project sponsor is made real and available to every building occupant and visitor, regardless of their tenancy start date.

Respectfully,

Alice Rogers

*affiliations noted fo context; no endorsement of my position implied

D6 Pedestrian Safety Group
Vision Zero Coalition

South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay NA (VP)

Walk SF

.....

Alice Rogers

10 South Park St

Studio 2

San Francisco, CA 94107

415.543.6554

(BOS)

From: Jorge Castillo [jorge.castillo425@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 11:27 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); Veneracion, April (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); OREN LAND USE ATTORNEY JOHN KEVLIN REF. 1370 TAYLOR ST.M31 AIR RIGHTS TDR's MARCH11 James Reuben
Cc: Jorge Castillo
Subject: 340 Bryant St.
Categories: 150171

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Jorge Castillo and for the last 15 years I've been an owner/resident at 461 Second Street. I'm directly across the freeway ramp from the project at 340 Bryant Street. I'm well aware of the existing traffic conditions surrounding the project site. After hearing the significant streetscape improvements the project sponsor is willing to make, I'm fully in support of the project. Please deny the appeal of the project's CEQA review, as it will result in more study and delay, rather than actual improvements to pedestrian and bicycle safety in the neighborhood.

Much appreciated your consideration on this matter.

Thank you.

Jorge Castillo
415-308-0908

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Item #22. 150171 Public Hearing - Appeal of Community Plan Exemption from Environmental Review - 340 Bryant Street
Date: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 9:33:33 AM

From: Jamie Whitaker [mailto:jamiewhitaker@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 10:51 PM
To: Kim, Jane (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Christensen, Julie (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Avalos, John (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); nicole@walksf.org; Paolo Cosulich-Schwartz; Rahaim, John (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC)
Subject: Item #22. 150171 Public Hearing - Appeal of Community Plan Exemption from Environmental Review - 340 Bryant Street

Dear Supervisors,

First, I want to thank you greatly for your support of File number 150119, Transportation Code - Narration by Tour Bus Drivers. I'll never forget looking out my office window to see my friend and co-worker Precy Moreto crushed and bleeding just past the crosswalk on Polk Street in front City Hall. I think of Precy every day, and I am glad to see the traffic stoplight equipment installed at that crosswalk to bring vehicles to a complete stop and allow pedestrians to safely cross. I have not used that crosswalk coming and going from work at City Hall since the tragic death of Precy on October 23rd. Thank you for supporting this sensible law to hopefully save lives going forward.

It is ironic that you're hearing about the extremely dangerous conditions in existence for pedestrians attempting to get to 340 Bryant Street that were approved by the Planning Department in the same week that we encourage folks to participate in Walk to Work Day.

If you want to see the dangerous conditions, I made a short 4 minute video on Easter Sunday afternoon that you can view here: <https://youtu.be/pdGJUnfjTUc>

While changing this building from a sparsely populated industrial use to a high-intensity, high-density office use may not seem to the Planning Department to warrant an EIR that focuses on the traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian conditions along with air pollution for the "rooftop open space," I am highly disappointed that anything less than a fully operational traffic stoplight, just like the one installed in front of City Hall on Polk Street after my co-worker Precy Moreto was killed in the unsafe crosswalk with rapid flashing lights, is a requirement prior to occupancy of the building by possibly up to 300 or more office workers.

Do we really mean it when we say we support Vision Zero and zero pedestrian fatalities if we're going to approve a project located within such a precarious highway ramp infested area without a fully functional traffic stoplight for several months? I guess it depends - maybe you think it would be fine to let a baby travel in the front seat of your car without a child safety seat for the first few months of his or her life. Why are we setting a precedent that it is okay to allow occupancy of this building by 300 people when conditions for them to come in to work, to go out to lunch, to return from lunch, and to go home in the evening are anything but Vision Zero safe for pedestrians?

Bryant Street is a free-for-all between Beale and 2nd Street because SFPD very rarely would

travel through the corridor - much less bother to enforce speeding laws. Westbound cars push the gas pedal down to get up a steep Rincon Hill incline and will have little time to slow down if a blind, mobility impaired, or senior citizen is in the midst of crossing the street if that driver has no early warning a good ways before at the bottom of the hill.

Cars heading eastbound to just get around the Bay Bridge HOV traffic in the afternoon hours also shove the gas pedal down as if to make up for lost time stuck in the mess at 2nd Street and Bryant.

I am not sure why the City will not withhold an occupancy permit until there is a fully functioning traffic stoplight to show that when San Francisco says we want to embrace Vision Zero and have zero pedestrian fatalities by 2024, we mean it. I think the building owner is lucky that he office space use was approved because the addition of more office space is exactly what has been exacerbating the influx of people making 2x's to 3x's the salaries of existing residents and pricing those existing residents out of their homes - not to mention causing more air pollution because about 50% end up driving into the City instead of taking transit, in general.

John Rahaim has to sign off on a Traffic Management Plan before the building can be occupied. If you all truly embrace the idea of Vision Zero, you should require that a fully functional traffic stoplight be installed for the workers in this building to have the safest chance to make it home to their loved ones after a day at work at 340 Bryant.

Pedestrians' Lives Matter.

Thank you,
Jamie Whitaker

Rincon Hill resident

(BOS)

From: Terzolo, Dave @ San Francisco [Dave.Terzolo@cbre.com]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 6:08 PM
To: Veneracion, April (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); jkevin@reubenlaw.com
Subject: 340 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA
Categories: 150171

Dear Supervisor Kim,

My name is Dave Terzolo and I am a commercial real estate broker active in SOMA for the past 20 years. I am excited that 340 Bryant Street, a once blighted warehouse building, is being renovated and beautified for better use. However, I understand the 340 Bryant project is being challenged due to an appeal. I am well aware of the existing and a very unique traffic conditions surrounding the project site as I was the building's sales agent and showed the building numerous times during the marketing process and experienced crossing Bryant Street (and dodging cars) many, many times. 340 Bryant is, as you know, very uniquely situated and the building itself is essentially bordered by city/state-owned properties. I learned about the significant streetscape improvements the project sponsor is willing to make. I believe the renovation of 340 Bryant will overall improve the whole neighborhood and support the local economy. Adding more office supply will encourage more companies to keep new jobs within the city rather than moving away from the city and adding more PDR supply encourages PDR tenants to stay within the city as well.

I'm in full support of the 340 Bryant Street renovation project. Please deny the appeal of the project's CEQA review, as it will result in more delay rather than actual improvements to the overall neighborhood. Thank you.

Best regards,

Dave

Dave Terzolo | Senior Vice President | Lic. 00906167
Investment Properties
CBRE | Capital Markets
101 California Street, 44th Floor | San Francisco, CA 94111
T 415 291 1732 | F 415 291 8208 | C 415 254 9057
Dave.Terzolo@cbre.com | www.cbre.com

Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message.

(BOS)

From: James, Travis [Travis.James@am.jll.com]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 5:14 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); Veneracion, April (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS)
Cc: John Kevlin
Subject: 340 Bryant

Categories: 150171

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Travis James and I am a commercial real estate broker active in SOMA. I am excited that a once blighted warehouse building is being renovated for better use. However, I understand the 340 Bryant renovation project is being challenged due to an appeal on the project. I am well aware of the existing unique traffic conditions surrounding the project site, and after learning about the significant streetscape improvements the project sponsor is willing to make, I am fully in support of the project. I believe the renovation of 340 Bryant will overall improve the whole neighborhood and support San Francisco's local economy. Furthermore, I would like building developers to be encouraged to improve blighted buildings which become hotbeds of crime and make neighborhoods less safe for families. Finally, I understand this developer is going above and beyond the MUO zoning that it bought the building based on, and is developing the ground floor for PDR space. There are several PDR tenants that need homes in SOMA, and if this developer is not encouraged to create that space, who will? Please deny the appeal of the project's CEQA review, as it will result in more study and delay, rather than actual improvements to the overall neighborhood.

Thank you in advance.

Travis C. James
Managing Director
One Front Street, Suite 1100
San Francisco, CA 94111
tel +1 415 354 6960 fax +1 312 470 8265
mobile +1 650 248 0953
Travis.James@am.jll.com
www.jll.com
License #: 01773977



This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete it. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not keep, use, disclose, copy or distribute this email without the author's prior permission. We have taken precautions to minimize the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. The information contained in this communication may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages from us in the future then please respond to the sender to this effect.

(BOS)

From: Withers, Charlie @ San Francisco [Charlie.Withers@cbre.com]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 4:25 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); Veneracion, April (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); jkevin@reubenlaw.com
Subject: 340 Bryant

Categories: 150171

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Charlie Withers and I am a commercial real estate broker active in SOMA. I am excited that a once blighted warehouse building is being renovated for better use. However, I understand the 340 Bryant renovation project is being challenged due to an appeal on the project. I am well aware of the existing unique traffic conditions surrounding the project site, and after learning about the significant streetscape improvements the project sponsor is willing to make, I am fully in support of the project. I believe the renovation of 340 Bryant will overall improve the whole neighborhood and support San Francisco's local economy. Furthermore, I would like building developers to be encouraged to improve blighted buildings which become hotbeds of crime and make neighborhoods less safe for families. Finally, I understand this developer is going above and beyond the MUO zoning that it bought the building based on, and is developing the ground floor for PDR space. There are several PDR tenants that need homes in SOMA, and if this developer is not encouraged to create that space, who will? Please deny the appeal of the project's CEQA review, as it will result in more study and delay, rather than actual improvements to the overall neighborhood. Thank you.

Charlie Withers | Senior Vice President | Lic. 01414522
CBRE | Brokerage Services
101 California Street, Suite 4400 | San Francisco, CA 94111
T 415 291 1715 | F 415 291 8208 | C 415 637 3490
Charlie.Withers@cbre.com | www.cbre.com

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message