

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E
Date: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 5:39:52 PM

From: Jerry Schimmel [mailto:jschim40@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 3:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E

September 5, 2017
Members of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration
for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E

Honorable Members:

I am writing in support of the neighbors on Folsom Street who will be affected by the construction proposal, the number of which is cited above. They are requesting a “complete, open and transparent Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project at 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street.”

I do not live at that site. I am about three blocks east, however the mentioned pipeline passes about twenty-five feet north of my house and continues east under the pavement of Bernal Heights Boulevard. I witnessed its installation some 35 odd years ago.

I was also here when the pipeline in San Bruno exploded and flattened more than 30 homes. Eight residents were killed in their homes when the explosion occurred and dozens were seriously injured.

From my standpoint the lack of knowledge about the depth of the line is a serious deficiency and begs for the openness requested by the Folsom Street neighbors.

For myself if the pipeline went off up here a minimum of four homes would be flattened. All are wood frame buildings which have no ability to withstand a detonation like the San Bruno incident.

I trust you will give the Folsom Street neighbors a fair hearing and that the process will work out for all concerned.

Jerry F. Schimmel
40 Prentiss Street
San Francisco CA 94110

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: File 170851

BOS - W, C pages
File No. 170851

From: Ramon Romero [mailto:Ramon49r@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
Subject: File 170851

RAMON E. ROMERO
66 Banks Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

September 7, 2016

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

RE: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration
Planning Case No. 2013.12.16.4318 and 2-13.12.16.4322
Building Permit Application Nos. 2013.12.16.4318 and 2-13.12.16.4322
3516-3526 Folsom Street

Dear President Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am the resident and homeowner of 66 Banks Street located near the above-referenced lots. I have resided at that address since May of 1994. I am also the owner of the vacant lot (Lot29) located directly behind my home and directly across from the lot designated as 3516 Folsom. I am writing to comment on the matters before you.

President Breed may recall that I served with her on the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission which, of course, dealt extensively with real estate development projects both for residential and commercial purposes. I was appointed to the Redevelopment Commission in 1998 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. and reappointed by him in 2001. I was subsequently reappointed to the Commission in 2005 by Mayor Gavin Newsom. It was during my last appointment that I served on the Commission with President Breed. During my tenure, I was twice elected President of the Commission and had the honor of being the first Latino to serve in that capacity. My 11½ years of service on the Commission is described in detail in the resolution that was

adopted at the time of my resignation. See Item 4(b) of the Commission meeting minutes at this link: http://sfocii.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/332-a_102009MINS.pdf

During 2015, I attended two meetings of the Bernal Heights East Slope Design Review Board at which Mr. Fabien Lannoye presented his and Mr. Fogarty's plans for development at the two sites in question. I found Mr. Lannoye to be congenial, cooperative, attentive, and understanding of the input provided by Bernal Heights residents who were in attendance. He presented his building plans in writing for everyone to review and answered questions directly and without equivocation. His behavior was professional and friendly at all times without exception. This was all true in the face of sometimes hostile, emotional, and irrational attacks from a couple of the individuals in attendance.

I should add that the development of the house that I reside in at 66 Banks, as well as the two houses next to mine, met hostile resistance from the neighbors when the homebuilder went through the planning process in the early-1990's. My house and the two next to me were built on the same hillside field where Mr. Lannoye and Mr. Fogarty seek to build. Similarly, the developer, Mr. Aldo Stemberga, was required to build a street in order to build the houses he eventually completed. Even though I was totally unaware and uninvolved in Mr. Stemberga's development, I was met with hostility from some of the neighbors simply because I purchased and moved into my house. I was shocked to see that kind of a reaction from otherwise rational San Franciscans who live in a dense urban environment and should accept the fact that privately owned, vacant, buildable lots will ultimately be developed as our city grows.

The appellants' objection concerning the gas pipeline is nothing more than a scare tactic. There is no gas leak in the pipeline on the slope in question. After careful study and review it has been determined that it is a stable pipeline. Its location is clearly marked by a PG&E post stating that there is a pipeline below. Is this the only underground gas pipeline in San Francisco? Of course not and streets and houses have been constructed all over the city without blowing up the surrounding neighborhoods. Leaflets were passed out throughout our neighborhood warning that we were in the "blast zone." My house is among the closest to the pipeline in question. I refuse to be swayed by such terroristic tactics and the Board should not be either.

I moved into my house in 1994 and purchased the lot directly behind my house in 1997. My desire was to keep open space behind me for as long as I could. I have succeeded in doing so for more than 20 years. However, I knew that because I did not buy all six lots behind my house that there might be development of the other five lots someday. These six lots sit on an attractive grassy hillside and it is understandable that residents in the area would want to keep it that way. I enhanced the beauty of my lot by planting a succulent garden. I intend to continue that use of my lot for the foreseeable future. The people who oppose this development want to keep all of these lots as open space, i.e., like a *de-facto* extension of Bernal Hill Park. Unfortunately, they do not have the right to do so and have conjured up any argument that they can think of to maintain this open space.

It is my understanding that Mr. Lannoye has cooperated with Planning Agency staff and Department of Public Works staff in advancing his development plans. In particular, he has expressed to me his willingness to mitigate as much as possible any potential adverse effect on the two houses that are located at the bottom of the extension of Folsom Street that he intends to construct.

All of the objections that have been stated by the appellants in previous Planning Commission meetings have been studied and dismissed by the Planning Commission.

It is inevitable that you reach the same conclusion that I have, i.e., that Mr. Lannoye and Mr. Fogarty have the right to build on their lots. These lots are zoned for the purpose that they intend. They have cooperated with Planning Department and Department of Public Works staff in planning the houses and the street. Most importantly, they have attempted to cooperate with the residents in good faith. San Franciscans who live in a

dense urban environment should accept the fact that privately owned, vacant, buildable lots will ultimately be developed as our city grows.

The Board should deny the instant appeals without further delay.

Very truly yours,

Ramon E. Romero

Sent from my iPhone

cc. Hon. Hilary Ronen; Mr. Herbert Felsenfeld

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\); Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E
Date: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 5:39:51 PM

From: Jerry Schimmel [mailto:jschim40@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 3:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E

September 5, 2017
Members of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: Appeal of CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration
for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E

Honorable Members:

I am writing in support of the neighbors on Folsom Street who will be affected by the construction proposal, the number of which is cited above. They are requesting a “complete, open and transparent Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project at 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street.”

I do not live at that site. I am about three blocks east, however the mentioned pipeline passes about twenty-five feet north of my house and continues east under the pavement of Bernal Heights Boulevard. I witnessed its installation some 35 odd years ago.

I was also here when the pipeline in San Bruno exploded and flattened more than 30 homes. Eight residents were killed in their homes when the explosion occurred and dozens were seriously injured.

From my standpoint the lack of knowledge about the depth of the line is a serious deficiency and begs for the openness requested by the Folsom Street neighbors.

For myself if the pipeline went off up here a minimum of four homes would be flattened. All are wood frame buildings which have no ability to withstand a detonation like the San Bruno incident.

I trust you will give the Folsom Street neighbors a fair hearing and that the process will work out for all concerned.

Jerry F. Schimmel
40 Prentiss Street
San Francisco CA 94110

cc. Hon. Hilary Ronen; Mr. Herbert Felsenfeld

August 28, 2017

File No. 170851
BOS-11, Cragg

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102
Dear Honorable Members of the Board

Re: Appeal of CEQA Categorical Exemption ("CatEx") Determination for Planning Case No. 2013.1383E

We request a complete, open, coordinated and transparent environmental impact review (EIR) for the proposed project at 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street.

- Our neighborhood is negatively impacted by this project. It threatens public safety as it is located adjacent to an aging 26-inch major gas transmission line 109. Line depth has never been determined. Line 109 is similar to one that blew up in the San Bruno disaster this past decade.
- If approved, heavy earth moving equipment will be travelling over this line for many months. In recent years a cement truck overturned on a nearby street. The area of Upper Folsom is one of the steepest in the City. We fear for public safety in this area.
- Parking impact and traffic will be similarly negatively affected. No new on-street parking is proposed; two garages and driveways currently in use will be rendered un-useable; residents will be unable to park cars needed for work and transportation. Traffic congestion at the corner of Folsom & Chapman, already difficult, will become unmanageable. The proposed project is a "gateway" for four (4) other sites on the property to be developed. When this occurs the project now becomes a six (6) unit "mini-sub-division". The environmental problems will surely, only, get worse.

Thank you, for considering our concerns for opposing the "CatEx" for this project, and, instead determining the need for an EIR.

Sincerely,
Janet Moomaw and Karen K.C. Cohen
janetmoomaw@comcast.net